SPEED LIMIT REVIEW CHECKLIST FORM

SITE DETAILS

RED TEXT = Engineer undertaking SLR to complete
GREEN TEXT = Responsible Officer to complete

Road Authority: ☐ Department of Transport and Main Roads District

☒ Local Government Agency

Date of Assessment: 14/10/22

Assessor: John Smith

Road Name: Medaly Road

LGA Name: Coastal Regional Council

Road Number (if applicable):

TMR District Name: Sunshine Coast District

Suburb: Medaly

Reference: 221014 Medaly Road – 02

	Location or Reference Point	Chainage or Distance	GPS Coordinates (decimal degrees)	
			Latitude	Longitude
Start	Semi-Urban Boarder	1.09	-27.029315	153.051445
End	Urban Boarder	2.82	-27.032626	153.067894

Existing Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Segment Length (km): 1.73

Traffic Volume (vpd): 1,250

Aerial Imagery of Speed Zone:

Pedestrian Volume (ppd): 2



STAGE 1 – NEED FOR REVIEW IDENTIFIED?

Detail circumstances that lead to a speed limit review being requested (*QRSTUV GSM Section 3.5.1*):

Five year review.

Desktop Review - Detail circumstances that require the need for a full speed limit review to be undertaken:

Desktop review of this section of road were identified to be reviewed, so entire road length was reviewed as well for completeness. Identified due to new developments along section

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW CHECKLIST FORM

STAGE 2 – CRITERIA BASED SPEED LIMIT (CBSL) ASSESSMENT

1. Is the road segment a foreshore? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.1 for definition of foreshore*
   ☒ No – go to Question 2
   ☐ Yes –refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.1 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

2. Is the road considered a car park or access driveway?
   ☒ No – go to Question 4
   ☐ Yes – go to Question 3

3. In the car park, are traffic calming devices present?
   ☒ No –adopt 20km/h speed limit and go to Stage 6 (Engineer Recommendation)
   ☐ Yes – adopt 10 km/h speed limit and go to stage 6 (Other considerations)

4. Is the road segment a Shared Zone? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.2 for definition of Shared Zone*
   ☒ No – go to Question 5
   ☐ Yes – refer to Section 4.3.2 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

5. Is the road unsealed or have a narrow seal? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.3 for definition of unsealed road or road with a narrow seal.*
   ☒ No – go to Question 6
   ☐ Yes – refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.3 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

6. Is the speed zone a High Active Transport User Area (HATUA)? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.4 for definition of HATUA*
   ☒ No – go to Question 7
   ☐ Yes – refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.4 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

7. Is the speed zone an Urban Local / Access Street? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.5 for Urban Local / Access Street definition*
   ☒ No – go to Question 8
   ☐ Yes – refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.5 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

8. Is the speed zone considered to be a footpath or shared path with a different posted speed to the road? *Refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.6 for Footpath or shared path speed zones definition*
   ☒ No – CBSL do NOT apply, go to Stage 3 (Risk Assessed Speed Limit) and Stage 4 (Speed Data Speed Limit)
   ☐ Yes – refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 4.3.6 and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

STAGE 3 – RISK ASSESSED SPEED LIMIT (RASL) ASSESSMENT

Crash Risk Rating (CRR)				
DCA Group	**Description**	**(L) FSI Index**	**(H) FSI Index**	**No. Casualty Crashes**
1	Intersection, from adjacent approaches	0.46	0.73	
2	Head-on	0.85	1.44	
3	Opposing vehicles, turning	0.53	0.84	
4	Rear-end	0.25	0.37	
5	Lane change	0.34	0.42	
6	Parallel lanes, turning	0.36	0.59	
7	U-turn	0.39	0.57	
8	Entering roadway	0.38	0.71	
9	Overtaking, same direction	0.50	0.65	
10	Hit parked vehicle	0.43	0.81	
11	Hit train	1.07	0.90	
12	Pedestrian	0.60	0.98	
13	Permanent obstruction on carriageway	0.28	0.53	
14	Hit animal	0.53	0.55	
15	Off carriageway, on straight	0.54	0.70	
16	Off carriageway, on straight, hit object	0.60	0.66	
17	Out of control, on straight	0.55	0.73	
18	Off carriageway, on curve	0.65	0.59	
19	Off carriageway, on curve, hit object	0.65	0.71	
20	Out of control, on curve	0.67	0.66	
21	Other	0.51	0.63	

Infrastructure Risk Rating (IRR)	
Road Attribute	**Category**
Road stereotype	Two lane undivided (3.7)
Alignment	Straight (1.0)
Sealed shoulder width	Very Narrow Shoulder
Lane width	Narrow (2.01)
Roadside hazard risk - left side	Moderate (1.43)
Roadside hazard risk - right side	Moderate (1.43)
Land use	Rural Residential (1.5)
At-grade intersection density	1-2/km (1.15)
Access density	3-5/km (1.03)
Traffic volume	1-6,000vpd (1.4)
IRR Score	**1.42**
Road Risk Metric (RRM)	
CRR Band	Low
IRR Band	Medium
RRM	Medium
Road Classification	
Environmental Context Class	**Semi-Urban**
Functional Classification	**Trunk Collector**

Est. FSI per 10^8 VKT	0.00

Risk Assessed Speed Limit (km/h)	**80**

Crash Data Period (5 years)	
From (inclusive):	1/1/2017
To (inclusive):	31/12/2021

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW CHECKLIST FORM

Additional comments (if required):

RASL was undertaken for both Gazettal and Against-Gazettal carriageways.

The results shown above are of the Gazettal carriageway.

The Against-Gazettal Carriageway came out with the same RRM score

STAGE 4 – SPEED DATA SPEED LIMIT (SDSL) ASSESSMENT

Mean Speed (km/h): 72

Speed Data Conforms with Speed Limit (Y/N) : N

Upper Limit of 15km/h Pace Speed (km/h): 82

Speed Limit Suggested by Speed Data (km/h): 80

Percentage within Pace Speed (%): 57.5

Speed Data Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Additional comments (if required) (e.g. dates, times, locations and descriptions of speed data collected):

Speed Data was collected over a 7-day period. Vehicle data recorded on Monday-Friday between 6am and 6pm was utilised for the speed data analysis.

The speed data was collected on a straight segment.

The conditions at the time were clear and dry. The road was free of any road works and maintenance.

Count data was obtained from Probe Speed Data.

While the speed data does not conform (i.e. percentage within pace is less than 60% with existing speed limit of 80 km/h. the upper limit of 15 km/h pace speed (82 km/h) results in suggesting the speed limit of 80 km/h (as per QRSTUV GSM Table 5.2.3) is to be retained.

STAGE 5 – ASSESSED SPEED CONSIDERATION

1. Does SDSL Correlate with RASL?
   - ☐ No – go to Question 2
   - ☒ Yes – consider correlated Speed Limit and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

2. Is SDSL lower than RASL?
   - ☐ No – consider RASL & consider speed management activities and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)
   - ☐ Yes – consider SDSL and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

Considered Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Additional comments related to speed management activities (if required) (*QRSTUV GSM Section 6.1*):

N/A

STAGE 6 – OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Are there other site specific circumstances that may apply or exist that could affect the selection of an appropriate speed limit? (refer to *QRSTUV GSM Section 7* for relevant guidance, sub-sections as per below):

	Yes	No
Is there school activity in the speed zone? (*Section 7.1*)	☐	☒
Is a variable speed limit sign appropriate? (*Section 7.2*)	☐	☒
Is a dual speed zone required? (*Section 7.3*)	☐	☒
Is the road a traffic carrying road through strip-shopping centres or commercial area? (*Section 7.4*)	☐	☒
Is the road a speed zone on an arterial road through a rural town? (*Section 7.5*)	☐	☒
Is there a high crash rate? (*Section 7.6*)	☐	☒
Is there a high crash rural intersection? (*Section 7.7*)	☐	☒
Is the road being considered for a 110km/h speed limit? (*Section 7.8*)	☐	☒
Does the road have a rough surface? (*Section 7.9*)	☐	☒
Is there a temporary speed limit being proposed? (*Section 7.01*)	☐	☒
Is the speed limit for a roundabout? (*Section 7.11*)	☐	☒
Is the road mountainous? (*Section 7.12*)	☐	☒
Is the road a service road? (*Section 7.13*)	☐	☒
Is there a signalised intersection on the road section? (*Section 7.14*)	☐	☒
Is the road section an on or off ramp? (*Section 7.15*)	☐	☒
Is the road section a laneway? (*Section 7.16*)	☐	☒
Is the speed limit proposed to be offset? (*Section 7.17*)	☐	☒
Are there other circumstances to consider? (*Section 7.18*)	☐	☒

Assessed Speed Limit (km/h): N/A

Additional comments related to other considerations (if required, particularly noting if there is more than one speed limit, such as for a school zone, variable speed limits, dual speed limits or path speed limits):

N/A

STAGE 7 – ENGINEER RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL ASSESSMENTS

Stage 2 – CBSL Apply (Y/N): N

if Yes, Details: .....

Stage 3 – RASL Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Safety Works Required (Y/N): N

Stage 4 – SDSL Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Stage 5 – Considered Speed Limit (km/h): 80

Speed Management Activities Recommended: (Y/N): N

Stage 6 – Assessed Speed Limit (km/h): N/A

More than one Speed: (Y(km/h)/N): N

Stage 7 – Recommended Speed Limit (km/h): 80

More than one Speed: (Y(km/h)/N): N

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW CHECKLIST FORM

ENGINEERS RECOMMENDATION:

Does the recommended speed limit align with the technical assessments assessed speed limit summarised above (Y/N): Y

If Yes, provide details of any accompanying works or 'context for suitability of the (QRSTUV GSM Section 8) recommended speed limit (if applicable):

The RASL, due to the IRR appears to indicate a Medium RRM score for this Trunk Collector semi-urban road, and 80 km/h speed limit. The SDSL also indicates that drivers are driving below the existing 80 km/h. This would indicate that the retention of a 80 km/h speed limit would appear appropriate without any additional measures necessary.

If No, detail alternate recommendation and provide reasons / justification of your (the Engineers) recommended speed limit:

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW - RECOMMENDED SPEED LIMIT (km/h): 80

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER'S ACCEPTANCE OF ENGINEERS RECOMMENDATION:

Do you (the Responsible Officer) accept the speed limit review and engineer recommendations undertaken by the Engineer:

☐ No – return to suitably qualified Engineer to repeat Stages 1 - 6 with justification

☒ Yes – submit to SMC

Name: Jane Smith

Position: Manager (Road Operations)

Signature: Signature Here

Date: 28/10/22

NOTE: In accepting the Engineering Recommendation the responsible officer accepts that the speed limit review has been completed in accordance with the process outlined within the TMR's QRSTUV GSM, by a certified engineer experienced in undertaking speed limit reviews and general road safety matters. It is not for the Responsible Officer to question the Engineering Recommendation if the speed limit review has been conducted appropriately.

If No, detail why the speed limit review was not accepted (if required):

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW CHECKLIST FORM

STAGE 8 – APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

SPEED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE FINDINGS:

SMC Endorse Engineers' Recommendations (Y/N): Y Date of SMC: 14/11/22

If No, provide justification:

……

……

……

……

……

NOTE: Attach documented findings from the Speed Management Committee to this Form

Where the SMC has **NOT** endorsed the recommendations of the engineer, the responsible officer shall require the engineer to reconsider the recommendation (*refer to QRSTUV GSM Section 9.2*).

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER APPROVAL:

Approved Speed Limit (km/h): 70 Name: Jane Smith

Additional Approved Works (if applicable): …… Position: Manager (Road Operations)

…… Signature: Signature Here

…… Date: 28/11/22

NOTE: The responsible officer shall provide a copy of the documentation that supports this Speed Limit Review to either through the approved online system or email to speedlimitreview@tmr.qld.gov.au.

STAGE 9 – MONITOR & EVALUATE

Will the speed limit or speed environment be altered as a result of the recommendations contained within this speed limit review?

☒ Yes – program post-implementation to occur within 3 months following implementation and schedule routine review in 5 years or sooner
☐ No – schedule routine review in 5 years or sooner

Date of Next Review: 28/2/2023

MISCELLANEOUS

Enhanced enforcement of this site by QPS has been requested by reporting the outcome of this speed limit review to:

☐ Local Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC)
☐ Local Speed Management Committee (SMC)
☐ Regional QPS Traffic Co-Ordinator

Reported by: ……

Position: ……

Date: ……

Additional Comments (if required):

……

……

……

……