

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) | | | | | Infrastructure Risk Rating (IRR) | | |
|--|--|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| DCA Group | Description | (L) FSI Index | (H) FSI Index | No. Casualty Crashes | Road Attribute | Category | |
| 1 | Intersection, from adjacent approaches | 0.46 | 0.73 | | Road stereotype | Two lane undivided (3.7) | |
| 2 | Head-on | 0.85 | 1.44 | | Alignment | Straight (1.0) | |
| 3 | Opposing vehicles, turning | 0.53 | 0.84 | | Sealed shoulder width | Very Narrow Shoulder | |
| 4 | Rear-end | 0.25 | 0.37 | | Lane width | Narrow (2.01) | |
| 5 | Lane change | 0.34 | 0.42 | | Roadside hazard risk - left side | Moderate (1.43) | |
| 6 | Parallel lanes, turning | 0.36 | 0.59 | | Roadside hazard risk - right side | Moderate (1.43) | |
| 7 | U-turn | 0.39 | 0.57 | | Land use | Rural Remote (1.0) | |
| 8 | Entering roadway | 0.38 | 0.71 | | At-grade intersection density | <1/km (1.0) | |
| 9 | Overtaking, same direction | 0.50 | 0.65 | | Access density | <1/km (1.0) | |
| 10 | Hit parked vehicle | 0.43 | 0.81 | | Traffic volume | 1-6,000vpd (1.4) | |
| 11 | Hit train | 1.07 | 0.90 | | IRR Score | 1.17 | |
| 12 | Pedestrian | 0.60 | 0.98 | | | | |
| 13 | Permanent obstruction on carriageway | 0.28 | 0.53 | | Road Risk Metric (RRM) | | |
| 14 | Hit animal | 0.53 | 0.55 | | CRR Band | Low | |
| 15 | Off carriageway, on straight | 0.54 | 0.70 | | IRR Band | Medium | |
| 16 | Off carriageway, on straight, hit object | 0.60 | 0.66 | | RRM | Medium | |
| 17 | Out of control, on straight | 0.55 | 0.73 | | | | |
| 18 | Off carriageway, on curve | 0.65 | 0.59 | | Road Classification | | |
| 19 | Off carriageway, on curve, hit object | 0.65 | 0.71 | | Environmental Context Class | Rural | |
| 20 | Out of control, on curve | 0.67 | 0.66 | | Functional Classification | Trunk Collector | |
| 21 | Other | 0.51 | 0.63 | | | | |
| Est. FSI per 10⁸ VKT | | 0.00 | | | Risk Assessed Speed Limit (km/h) | | 90 |
| Crash Data Period (5 years) | | | | | | | |
| From (inclusive): | | 1/1/2017 | | | | | |
| To (inclusive): | | 31/12/2021 | | | | | |

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): 75 Speed Data Conforms with Speed Limit (Y/N) : Y
Upper Limit of 15km/h Pace Speed (km/h): 88 Speed Limit Suggested by Speed Data (km/h): N/A
Percentage within Pace Speed (%): 68.3
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 Speed Data.

STAGE 5 – ASSESSED SPEED CONSIDERATION

- 1. Does SDSL Correlate with RASL? [X] 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) [X] Yes – consider SDSL and go to Stage 6 (Other considerations)

Assessed 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):

Table with 2 columns: Question, Yes, No. Contains 14 rows of questions regarding school activity, speed limit signs, vehicle classes, road types, crash rates, and other circumstances.

Considered 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, speed limits for a specific vehicle class 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): | 100 | Safety Works Required (Y/N): | N |
| Stage 4 – SDSL Speed Limit (km/h): | 80 | Speed Management Activities Recommended: (Y/N): | N |
| Stage 5 – Assessed Speed Limit (km/h): | 80 | More than one Speed: (Y(km/h)/N): | N |
| Stage 6 – Considered Speed Limit (km/h): | N/A | More than one Speed: (Y(km/h)/N): | N |
| Stage 7 – Recommended Speed Limit (km/h): | 80 | | |

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 both the CRR and IRR appears to indicate a Medium RRM score for this Trunk Collector Road, for which a 100 km/h speed limit is appropriate. However, the SDSL indicates that actual motorists speeds are consistent with an 80 km/hr speed limit. This would indicate that the retention of an 80 km/h speed limit would be more appropriate.

It is noted that the length of the speed zone is just below the recommended 1.2 km minimum, but felt appropriate for the location.

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
[X] 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):

Dotted lines for providing justification if the recommendation was not accepted.

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:

Dotted lines for providing justification if SMC did not endorse the recommendations.

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): 80
Additional Approved Works (if applicable):

Name: Jane Smith
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: 14/10/2027

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):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....