

Department for Planning and Infrastructure
on behalf of the Local Impacts Committee
(LIC)

Roe Highway Stage 7
Alignment Selection
Workshop
Workshop Workbook

October 2002

**Environmental Resources Management
Australia**
Level 6, 172 St Georges Terrace,
PERTH WA 6000
Telephone +61 8 9321 5200
Facsimile +61 8 9321 5262
www.erm.com

Department for Planning and Infrastructure
on behalf of the Local Impacts Committee
(LIC)

Roe Highway Stage 7
Alignment Selection
Workshop
Workshop Workbook

October 2002

Reference: 8021134

For and on behalf of
Environmental Resources Management
Australia

Approved by: Keryn James

Signed: _____

Position: Project Director

Date 17 October 2002

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	NEED FOR A WORKSHOP	1
1.2	WORKBOOK CONTENTS	1
1.3	PARTICIPANT REQUIREMENTS	2
2	BACKGROUND INFORMATION - ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 7 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	
2.1	OVERVIEW	3
2.2	SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	3
2.3	ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS	3
2.3.1	PREFERRED ALIGNMENT SELECTION	4
2.4	STRATEGIC NETWORK ISSUES	6
2.4.1	DESIGN ISSUES	9
2.4.2	PROCESS ISSUES	10
2.5	PUBLIC OPEN DAYS	10
2.6	GROUP SUBMISSIONS	11
3	DESCRIPTION OF THE VALUE MANAGEMENT PROCESS	
4	ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 7 WORKSHOP	
4.1	OVERVIEW	15
4.2	SUMMARY OF AGENDAS	15
4.3	WORKSHOP PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	15
4.4	WORKSHOP PARAMETERS	15
4.5	OPTIONS	16
4.6	CRITERIA	17
4.6.1	EVALUATION CRITERIA	17
4.6.2	REFINEMENT CRITERIA	18
4.7	SELECTION OF PREFERRED OPTION	19
ANNEX A	SUMMARY OF GROUP SUBMISSIONS	
ANNEX B	WORKSHOP AGENDAS	
ANNEX C	ALIGNMENT OPTIONS	

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 NEED FOR A WORKSHOP

A Local Impacts Committee (LIC) has been established by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to consider alignment options and associated issues for Roe Highway Stage 7. The LIC has three Terms of Reference and the first requires the identification of a preferred alignment for Roe Highway Stage 7. The LIC is required to assess options within an agreed corridor and the potential options have been identified and defined.

An independent consultant, Environmental Resources Management Australia Pty Ltd (ERM), has been commissioned to facilitate a value management workshop process to assist the LIC to identify a preferred alignment.

This Workbook has been prepared by ERM to provide relevant background materials that need to be reviewed by workshop participants prior to the workshops. The workshop process is consensus based and therefore it is important that all participants attend both workshops. The workshops will be held on:

- Tuesday, 22 October 2002 – 9.00am – 12.00pm; and
- Wednesday, 23 October 2002 – 5.00pm – 8.30pm (light supper provided).

The venue for both workshops is:

Parliament House
Workshop 1 – Select Committee Room
Workshop 2 – Select Committee Room

1.2 WORKBOOK CONTENTS

This Workbook contains:

- Background information;
- Description of the value management process;
- A description of the proposed Workshop process for the Roe Stage 7 Alignment Selection;
- Specific information to be considered prior to the workshop including the list of options and draft criteria; and
- Workshop agendas.

1.3

PARTICIPANT REQUIREMENTS

These workshops are being conducted in the spirit of open and accountable decision making. Please bring with you:

- your sense of humour;
- patience;
- a willingness to listen and learn;
- your ability to compromise;
- lateral thinking caps; and
- respect for other participants.

2 *BACKGROUND INFORMATION - ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 7 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION*

2.1 *OVERVIEW*

A public consultation process has been conducted prior to the workshop to assist the LIC to identify those issues that are important to the community and should be considered in selecting an alignment for Roe Highway Stage 7. The following section provides a summary of the submissions and issues raised at the public open days.

2.2 *SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED*

A total of 434 submissions were received during the submission period. The submissions consisted of:

- Written submissions (206 responses)

Responses were received in the form of:

- comment sheets;
- emails and
- letters to the LIC.

- Form letters (222 responses)

Responses were provided by form letter, however as the form letter provided options for the respondent, the results indicate that it is not a 'standard' form letter.

- Petition (6 responses)

Respondents signed a petition addressed to the City of Melville.

It should be noted that 10 respondents who submitted a form letter in support of Option D also submitted a letter or email response. As many of the letter or email responses lacked contact names and addresses, the total number of repeated submissions from individuals could be higher.

2.3 *ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS*

An analysis of the issues raised in submissions is provided below. There were a wide variety of issues raised in the submissions, some of which are directly related to the selection of a preferred route option and others that are related to broader strategic road network issues or detailed design. They have been analysed accordingly.

2.3.1

Preferred Alignment Selection

Preferred Alignment Options

The consultation process was aimed at getting community members to identify the key values or issues for the area within the proposed corridor. Notwithstanding this, many respondents indicated a preference for a particular alignment option, based on the alignment options that had been considered as part of the freight network review. Some of these options are within the specified corridor that is being considered by the LIC (Options A, A1, B or C), while others were outside the corridor.

Of the 99 respondents who indicated a preference for Option A, A1, B or C, equal numbers indicated a preference for Options A and C. It is difficult to determine where the majority of respondents who indicated support for Options A or C live, as 38 of these respondents did not indicate their home address.

However, of the 50 respondents who supported Option A, 9 respondents were from Leeming, 3 from Bullcreek and 4 from Jandakot. Other suburbs of origin included Bateman, Winthrop, Bibra Lake, North Lake and Rossmoyne.

Of the 46 respondents who supported Option C, 10 were from Leeming, 9 were from Bibra Lake and 7 were from North Lake. 5 respondents were from Coolbellup and one from Bicton.

Key Issues

Key issues for respondents in selecting an alignment were:

- Impacts on local environmental values;
- Traffic impacts on the local community;
- Noise and pollution; and
- Amenity (lifestyle and community).

These are discussed below.

Environmental Issues

Twenty-eight (28) respondents (13.5%) indicated general environmental concerns due to the construction of Stage 7. These responses were not specific to particular environmental issues or to particular local areas.

An additional 24 respondents (12%) indicated that **loss of bushland and particular local parks and reserves** as a result of construction of Roe Stage 7 were of concern. Most of these concerns related to the potential, such as:

- Ken Hurst Park (19 responses);

- Heatherlea Parkway (4 responses); and
- John Connell Reserve (2 responses).

Further to this, 25 respondents indicated concern for the loss of bushland and associated environmental impacts in the vicinity of Bibra Lake and North Lake. Whilst these responses do not relate directly to Stage 7, they may be attributed to a concern regarding the alignment of Stage 7 being an enabling factor to the construction of Stage 8.

Traffic Issues

Forty-nine (49) respondents (24.5%) indicated that a general **increase in traffic** as a result of either the construction or final use of Roe Highway was of concern. Many respondents referred to particular roads, such as:

- Farrington Road (14 responses);
- Karel Avenue (12 responses);
- Beasley Road (2 responses);
- Leach Highway; and
- Berrigan Drive.

Most of these roads are not directly connected to Roe Stage 7 but there is clearly a concern about the traffic implications.

Amenity

Twenty-two (22) respondents (11%) indicated that the construction of Roe Stage 7 would have negative effects on their **lifestyle** and negative effects on the **community** in general.

The reasons cited were predominantly related to concerns for pedestrian and motorist safety due to an increase in traffic, noise, house damage due to vibration and an overall devaluation of properties and trucks using exhaust brakes in residential areas

Twenty-seven (27) respondents (13.5%) indicated that **noise and pollution** as a result of the construction of Roe Highway Stage 7 was of concern.

Specific Comments Made by Respondents

From the 206 written submissions there were a number of specific comments which are of relevance the LIC workshop.

Table 2.1 *Comments on Alignment Selection Issues*

COMMENTS	NO. OF RESPONSES
Alignment should be as far south as possible –within MRS reservation or beyond	23
Maximise distance from homes and wildlife	13
Need noise impact study/ noise attenuation eg noise barriers	12
Owners were aware of alignment when properties purchased	9
Do not support Options A/ A1 or B	3
Support Option C or D if Stage 8 does not proceed	1
Roe Highway and Kwinana Freeway intersection should be 300 metres south	1
CONCERNS	
No road through Piney Lakes	1
Reduced property values and safety	8
Do not sell Roe Stage 7 land	3
Concerns about the Resource Recovery Centre	2
Damage to houses	1
Cultural concerns (sacred sites)	1
SUGGESTIONS	
Environmental impacts can be minimised	2
Rail freight a priority	2
Go ahead with the current alignment, rehabilitate and compensate	1
Construct a new east/west access onto Roe Highway from Karel Avenue	1
Construct a new access from Jandakot Airport to Roe Highway	1

2.4 *STRATEGIC NETWORK ISSUES*

A number of people who made submissions raised a number of issues that are not directly related to the selection of an alignment within the corridor that the LIC is considering. Key issues were:

- Support for Options outside the Corridor being Considered by the LIC - a significant number of people submitted a form letter (222) indicating a preference for Option D (south of Berrigan Drive, east of the airport) and 14% of people who made written submissions also supported Option D.

A high proportion of the respondents indicating support for Option D suggested that this option would have the least impact and address many of their concerns, such as:

- loss of bushland;
- effects of noise from increased traffic; and
- pressure on existing regional and local roads, such as Karel Avenue and Farrington Road.

Many respondents recognised that Option D might cost more to implement, however, some indicated that the sale of land within the existing MRS reservation may assist in recouping the funds. However, to others this was not a viable option as it fails to protect the natural vegetation corridor provided by the Reservation in its current state.

The majority of respondents to the form letter were from Leeming (193) and immediately surrounding suburbs. However, responses were also obtained from suburbs outside of the immediate Stage 7 consultation area, such as Shelley, Padbury, Success, Greenwood, Balga, Cloverdale, Huntingdale, Kingsley, Kewdale, Gosnells, Beckenham, Armadale and Landsdale. It is not known whether these responses are from absentee landowners.

- Other respondents indicated support for Options K, L or no Roe Stage 7 at all.
- Concerns about Roe Highway Stage 8 - with some respondents indicating that the reservation should be removed and others suggesting it should be retained and Government should ensure that Roe Stage 7 can be connected with Roe Stage 8 in the future.
- Comments on Fremantle Eastern Bypass (FEB) - a petition to the City of Melville with 6 signatures indicated support for the retention of the FEB.
- Concern about general traffic impacts on other parts of the network and the pressure that not building Roe Stage 8 and building Roe Stage 7 might result in, generating a number of suggestions and comments about different parts of the network:
 - Farrington Road - upgrading- a general concern about the safety of the intersection with Kwinana Freeway without Roe Highway Stage 8; and
 - Leach Highway and South Street - suggestion that there should be no upgrading reflecting a concern about the potential increase in traffic volumes on these roads. A petition to the City of Melville with 6 signatures was opposed to any move to reclassify Leach Highway or South Street to Freeway status.
- Concern about major intersections on other parts of the network and the potential for increased pressure, reflected in the suggestions for a variety of treatments. For example:
 - Karel Avenue / Farrington Road - identified as a key intersection likely to be under pressure. Suggestion that a roundabout should be provided at this intersection;
 - Leach Highway and High Road intersection - may need to be upgraded; and

- Farrington Road/Kwinana Freeway – on-off ramps (responses for and against).
- Concerns/suggestions about specific roads on the network:
 - Close Beasley Road;
 - Widen Hope Road;
 - Don't close:
 - Murdoch Drive;
 - Winthrop Drive;
 - Moolyeen Drive; and
 - Marcus Drive.
 - No road through Piney Lakes;
 - Farrington Road needs upgrading if Roe Stage 7 goes ahead;
 - No upgrade of Farrington Road;
 - Upgrade Stock Road to Freeway standard; and
 - Upgrade of Russell Road.

Specific comments on strategic network issues are listed in *Table 2.2*.

Table 2.2 *Comments on Strategic Network Issues*

COMMENTS	NO. OF RESPONSES
Use funds from sale of Roe Stage 7 land	12
Stage 7 must be aligned to enable Stage 8 in the future	10
Assess all options before deleting Stage 8 or Fremantle Eastern Bypass	9
Support termination at Freeway	5
Complete Roe Stage 6 and Stage 7 at the same time to minimise impacts	5
No Stage 8 - change freeway connection so it can't occur	5
No Stage 7	3
Do not upgrade South Street or Leach Highway	2
Do not create a freeway on/off ramp at Farrington Rd	2
Create a freeway on/off ramp at Hope Road	2
Transport corridors should support various types of infrastructure	2
More freight should be carried by rail	2
Stage 8 to be aligned with railway line	1
Oppose the alignment of Stage 8 along railway line	1
Create overpass over Beeliar Wetland (Stage 8)	1
Align Stage 8 further south	1
Realign Karel and Berrigan Drive to create a roundabout for access to Jandakot Airport	1
Upgrade the intersection Leach Highway and High Road	1
Upgrade Farrington Rd with Stage 7	1
Upgrade Stock Road to Freeway standard	1
Upgrade Russell Road	1
Do not upgrade Farrington Road	1
Widen Hope Rd	1
Don't close Murdoch Drive	1
Don't close Winthrop Avenue	1
Don't close Moolyeeen Drive	1
Don't close Marcus Drive	1
Close Beasley Road	1
Option D inefficient - impact on South Street	1
Freeway traffic will use South Street	1

2.4.1 *Design Issues*

There were limited comments made relating to specific design issues for Roe Stage 7. Of most significance, 12 respondents indicated that access should be maintained where Karel Avenue/Berrigan Drive intersects with Roe Highway. Most respondents indicated that this should be in the form of an overpass. Additional comments related to the construction of a bridge over the railway line (2 responses) and an overpass at Clifton Road (1 response). Specific comments are listed in *Table 2.3*.

Table 2.3 *Comments on Design Issues*

COMMENT	NO. OF RESPONSES
Traffic lights are needed at the Karel Avenue and Farrington Road intersection	4
Create a freeway on/off ramp at Farrington Rd	4
Create a freeway on/off ramp at Roe Highway	3
Create a roundabout at the intersection of Karel Ave and Farrington Road	1
Create an overpass at Willeri Drive	1
Traffic lights should not be installed at the Karel Ave/Farrington Rd intersection	1

2.4.2 *Process Issues*

The form letter responses indicated that an extension of the submission period is needed to enable the community to consider the Options in more detail. This was reflected in some of the written responses. In addition there was general agreement at the Banksia Park Primary School Public Open Day that more time and more information was needed in order for the community to make an informed comment on Roe Highway Stage 7.

2.5 *PUBLIC OPEN DAYS*

Two open day sessions were held on Saturday 28 September, 2002 at Banksia Park Primary School and Glen Iris Country Club. Approximately 50 people attended the Glen Iris session and approximately 150 people attended the Banksia Park Primary School session.

Key issues and questions raised at the Glen Iris session included:

- Transport impacts on Berrigan Drive;
- Concerns and questions about the extent of ‘rat running’ in the local area;
- Suggestion that a connection at Karel Avenue is likely to improve the efficiency however there were concerns that congestion on the Freeway would make the situation worse; and
- Concern that changing the alignment at this stage is inequitable given that people who live near the alignment have always expected the road to be constructed.

At the Beeliar Park Primary School the key issues were:

- The need to maintain the connection to Roe Stage 8 in order to ensure that the whole network would not be compromised in the future – this was a strongly held view;

- The view that the alignment should stay where it is – residents in the area have bought properties there with the knowledge that the road would be built – this was also a strongly held view;
- Concern that industry groups may not support the move to rail and questions about whether the impacts of rail (for example, noise) had been properly considered;
- The need to carefully consider environmental issues, particularly impacts on wetlands;
- Concerns about the level of information provided to the community about the options – they expected to find more information at the open days; and
- Insufficient time allowed for comment.

2.6 *GROUP SUBMISSIONS*

A number of submissions were received from institutional or community groups, including:

- City of Cockburn;
- City of Melville;
- City of Canning;
- Jandakot Airport Corporation;
- Water Corporation;
- Friends of Ken Hurst Park;
- Southern Metropolitan Regional Council;
- Air Sales WA;
- Beeliar Conservation and Heritage Council;
- North Lake Residents Association; and
- Melville Conservation Group.

A table listing the issues raised by some of these groups is included at *Annex A*. Additional submissions have been received this week and will be incorporated in the final submission report.

Value management workshops are a tool that can be used to systematically identify and evaluate options for solving a particular problem. It is not intended to be process that requires detailed information; rather it is a strategic level assessment based on an assessment of the key issues relevant to the problem.

Ideally, the process should be conducted in a single session, often for 2 days or more, depending on the nature of the issue and the number of potential solutions to be evaluated. For the purposes of the Roe Highway Stage 7 alignment selection study, the process has been separated into two sessions, of three and three-and-a-half hours long respectively. The truncation of the process has meant that some elements have been agreed prior to the workshops and others need to be shortened or simplified. Key elements in the process to be used for the Roe Highway Stage 7 workshop are described below. Detailed information to be used in the workshop, including a list of options and draft criteria are included in Chapter 4.

Step 1 - Preparation

This Workbook has been prepared assist participants to prepare for the workshop. Two separate face-to-face briefing sessions have also been held to familiarise participants with the issues and the process.

Step 2 - Issue Identification

The first step in the value management process is ensuring that all participants have a clear understanding of the issues and information relevant to the project. The key issue for the LIC is the need to identify a preferred route alignment for the Roe Highway Stage 7. LIC members have been selected for their knowledge of this issue.

Step 3 - Options for Addressing Issue

Once a clear understanding of the issues has been established participants then brainstorm potential solutions to the problem. All of the suggested options are listed and described. The options to be considered have already been determined.

Step 4 - Criteria for Evaluating Options

Evaluation criteria are criteria that are used to evaluate the options against one another to identify a preferred option. In order to be included, an evaluation criterion must:

- be able to differentiate between the options;
- not duplicate any other criterion; and
- be able to be assessed within the workshop timeframe.

Step 5 - Weighting Criteria

This step is aimed at identifying the relative importance of each of the criteria. The most transparent process for doing this is a 'pairwise' comparison. This involves comparing all of the criteria against one another. The process relies on participants coming to consensus about the relative importance of each criterion and is based on structured discussion and debate.

The number of times that a criterion is nominated as the more dominant determines how important it is. This process will be recorded in a matrix and projected onto a screen so that all participants can see it.

There is an opportunity to double check with the group, after the proportioned weighting process is calculated, that the weightings are a fair representation of their discussion. They can be modified subject to consensus.

Step 6 - Scoring Options

After the weightings have been determined they are put to one side and the group then considers the options. This involves giving each option a score for how well it performs against each of the criteria. This score is agreed by consensus and takes into account the relative performance of the options. The process is kept simple by allocating a score of between 0 and 10 for each criterion for all options. A score of 0 means that the option performs badly for that criterion and a score of 10 means that it performs well. *Table 3.1* illustrates the process.

Table 3.1 ***Option Scoring Process***

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Criteria 1	0	5	10
Criteria 2	2	10	2
Criteria 3	1	3	6

Step 7 – Preliminary Ranking of Options

A spreadsheet is used to combine the weightings with the scores to give an overall raw score for each option. The option with the highest 'score' is the most highly ranked option, before the refinement criteria are considered. This spreadsheet will be projected onto a screen so that all participants can see it.

Step 8 – Ranking Refinement

Additional factors such as value for money and impacts on timeframe are expected to be used to further refine the evaluation of the options. The use of these additional factors will be agreed at the first workshop.

Step 9 – Identification of Preferred Option

A preferred option will be selected following the refinement process as described above.

Step 10 - Action Planning and Risk Identification

Once a Preferred Option is identified, a process is undertaken whereby any risks and/or actions are identified. This provides a path for progressing the issue to the next stage and may include discussion of detailed design issues in the case of an alignment or site selection process.

Step 11 – Reporting/Recording

The workshop process and discussions will be recorded and the results presented in a report to the LIC.

4 ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 7 WORKSHOP

4.1 OVERVIEW

The following sections provide additional information that is specific to the Roe Highway Stage 7 workshop including:

- A statement of the workshop purpose;
- Workshop parameters that all participants must abide by;
- A description of the options;
- A list of draft criteria for discussion at Workshop 1; and
- Notes on the proposed use of cost and timeframe as Refinement Criteria.

4.2 SUMMARY OF AGENDAS

The workshops have been split into distinct sessions, as described below:

Workshop 1	Session 1 - Agreement on Evaluation Criteria Session 2 - Weighting Evaluation Criteria
Workshop 2	Session 1 - Scoring Options Session 2 - Ranking of Options (including refinement and selection of preferred option) Session 3 - Action Planning

Detailed agendas for the two workshops are attached at *Annex B*.

4.3 WORKSHOP PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the workshop is *“To select a preferred route alignment option for Roe Highway Stage 7 (between South Street and Kwinana Freeway) and formulate a recommendation to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure”*.

4.4 WORKSHOP PARAMETERS

It is important that workshop participants clearly understand the parameters for the workshop. These have been set to help us achieve our timeframe and stay focussed. The parameters have been determined by the Terms of Reference for the LIC and other commitments by Government.

The parameters are:

- Geographical – a corridor has been specified for the assessment and options to be considered must be located within this corridor.
- Options – 6 options have been already been identified and these are the only options to be considered. These are described further in Section 4.5.
- Standard of Construction – the alignment must accommodate a Freeway standard facility with grade separated crossings at South Street, Karel Avenue and Kwinana Freeway. It will also have a principal shared path connecting to local paths.
- The workshop will not consider broader network issues except where these are relevant to the evaluation of options for a preferred alignment.
- Timeframe – the Minister has indicated that she would prefer the project be ready for commencement of construction by mid-2004.
- Cost – the project budget, based on the current MRS alignment, is currently set at \$58 million.
- Strategic level assessment – the workshop will consider issues at a strategic level – we will not look at issues in detail.
- **No Parameters:**
 - There will be no discussion of detailed design issues except where this is relevant in the Action Planning session; and
 - Once options, criteria and any other issues have been discussed and agreed at a particular stage of the workshop, there will be no re-visiting of these factors.

Where issues are raised that cannot be dealt with in the scope of the workshop, these will be recorded and provided to the LIC in the report for consideration at a later date.

4.5

OPTIONS

The options have been derived based on the outcomes of the Freight Network Review and design improvements identified by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. The options are listed in *Table 4.1* and diagrams showing the options are included in *Annex C*.

Table 4.1 *List of Options*

OPTION	DESCRIPTION
Option A	Option A follows the current MRS alignment.
Option B	Option B uses the MRS alignment between South Street and Karel Avenue. Between Karel Avenue and the Freeway it is located south of the current MRS alignment, approximately in the middle of the corridor.
Option C	Option C follows the MRS alignment to a mid-point between South Street and Karel Avenue and then moves out of the current alignment to be located in the southern most part of the corridor along the railway.
Option A/S	Option A/S is the same as Option A with the exception that between Karel Avenue and South Street it follows a more southerly alignment.
Option B/S	Option B/S is the same as Option B with the exception that between Karel Avenue and South Street it follows a more southerly alignment.
Option C/S	Option C/S is the same as Option C with the exception that between Karel Avenue and South Street it follows a more southerly alignment.

4.6 *CRITERIA*

4.6.1 *Evaluation Criteria*

Some criteria have been developed in draft form to assist in the workshop, as shown in *Table 4.2*.

These draft criteria have been presented to the LIC and some comments have been provided. These criteria will be discussed and agreed at the first session of Workshop 1. Given the time restrictions, the total number of criteria needs to be limited to 10-12.

Table 4.2 Draft Criteria

NO.	CRITERIA	DEFINITION/MEASURE
1	Impacts on remnant banksia woodland	Area required to be cleared
2	Impacts on Declared Rare Flora	Plant communities affected
3	Impacts on Bush Forever Sites	Area required to be cleared outside MRS.
4	Noise impacts on adjacent residents	Proximity of residential uses to the road
5	Impacts on major services	Requirement to relocate causing disruption to consumers
6	Impacts on Groundwater Protection Areas	Extent to which an alignment option affects areas of various priorities
7	Impacts on land ownership	Requirement to acquire land – determined by the number of private versus Government owned sites
8	Impacts on buildings	Number of buildings required to be demolished for any option
9	Impacts on Aboriginal sites	Extent to which a site is directly or indirectly affected by any option
10	Visual Impacts	Extent to which visual amenity of existing residents is detrimentally affected by presence of the road including intersections
11	Transport efficiency of the proposed road link	Travel time on the new road link
12	Social equity	Extent to which an option is outside the existing MRS amendment
Additional Criteria that have been considered but are likely to be the same for all options		
	European heritage	
	Soils	
	Wetlands	
	Vibration	
	Air pollution	

4.6.2 Refinement Criteria

Discussion at the LIC meeting on Monday, 14 October 2002 confirmed that cost and the ability to meet the construction timeframe that has been indicated by the Minister, are also important factors. The value management process normally excludes cost as an evaluation criterion in the first instance, but uses it to assess ‘value for money’ as a way of refining the ranked options. For the purposes of the Roe Highway Stage 7 workshop it is proposed to use two refinement criteria:

- Cost of each option leading to a value for money assessment (final weighting score divided by cost); and

- Implications for timeframe (this is a reflection of the fact that some of the options may require environmental or other statutory approvals, which could affect the project timeframe).

These will be applied after the evaluation criteria have been applied, to allow the group to refine the option selection process.

4.7

SELECTION OF PREFERRED OPTION

A preferred option will be selected based on the application of the refinement criteria described above.

Annex A

Summary of Group Submissions

No.	Name & Details	Type of Sub	ALIGNMENT											NETWORK		
			Preferred S7 Option					Concerns with Stage 7				Other related comments & suggestions	FEB support	S8 support	OTHER COMMENTS	
			A	B	C	D	Other	Impact on environment (flora, fauna, bush-land, wetlands)	Increase in traffic	Detri-mental impact on life-style & com-unity	Increase in noise & air pol-lution					
6.	J Wishard Chairperson North Lake Residents Association 157 Progress Drive NORTH LAKE WA 6163 wishartj@tpg.com.au	Form						YES					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align S7 further south to relieve congestion in Cockburn & Fremantle and provide quicker access to proposed outer harbour Redirect funds from sale of reserve land to improve roads Reserve all bushland current existing in MRS 			
7.	O Langham Melville Conservation Group 47 Drew Road ARDROSS WA 6153	Letter						YES Ken Hurst Park					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend environmentally sustainable alignment for S7 - further south Current S7 reserve should be included in Ken Hurst Park & protected with an A class parks & recreation zoning Roe Hwy has already wiped out too many areas of bush & wetlands City of Melville conducted what appears to be a very sad campaign of misinformation 	N	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freight network increase to 30%, moved to transfer to outer harbour in Kwinana & inland container terminal at Kewdale are support Improvements to Leach Hwy, Stock and High Rds will improve environment for residents
8.	R Crockett Water Corporation Ross.Crockett@WaterCorporation.com.au	Email											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Corporation should be consulted at the design stage as has water and waste water services crossing the proposed corridor 			
9.	Dr Eddy Wajon Friends of Ken Hurst Park 16 Eckersley Heights WINTHROP WA 6150	Letter					B	Ken Hurst Park					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity a key value of Ken Hurst Park Preferred option is no Roe Hwy, upgrade South St and Leach Hwy instead. Second option - South St and Karel Ave. 			

No.	Name & Details	Type of Sub	ALIGNMENT								NETWORK						
			Preferred S7 Option					Concerns with Stage 7				Other related comments & suggestions	FEB support	S8 support	OTHER COMMENTS		
			A	B	C	D	Other	Impact on environment (flora, fauna, bush-land, wetlands)	Increase in traffic	Detri-mental impact on life-style & com-unity	Increase in noise & air pol-lution						
10.	S Trinca City of Canning 1317 Albany Highway CANNINGTON WA 6107	Email											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roe Hwy limited to single or dual lanes each way only • Minimalist interchanges • Minimal clearing • Remnant veg in road reserves kept as conservation reserve 				
11.	F George Chairperson Beeliar Conservation & Heritage Council Felicity.George@bigpond.com	Email		1				Ken Hurst Park					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S7 to connect with Fwy in vicinity of rail reserve 				

Annex B

Workshops Agendas

Workshop 1 - Criteria Confirmation and Weighting

TIME	ACTIVITY	PERSON
9.00am	Welcome	Tony McRae, Chair, LIC
9.05	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purpose of Workshops - Overview of Workshops 1 and 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshop Parameters - Agenda for Workshop 1 - Code of Conduct 	Keryn James, Facilitator
9.15am	Session 1 - Confirmation of Criteria <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion on Draft Criteria presented at LIC Meeting - agree wording and definition of each Criteria must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be sufficiently different from one another to avoid duplication • Enable the options to be differentiated • Be able to be assessed during the value management workshop in the context of the strategic level assessment that is being undertaken There should be no more than 10 - 12 criteria.	Keryn James
9.45am	Session 2 - Criteria Weighting - Pairwise Comparison <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explanation of Process 2. Weighting of Criteria: Using pairwise comparison each criterion will be assessed against all other criteria to identify which is more important. As far as possible consensus will be the objective, however, if necessary a 'majority' decision will be taken to avoid stalemates.	Keryn James All
10.15am	COFFEE BREAK	
10.25am	Criteria Weighting (cont...) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Review Criteria Weightings The criteria weightings will be recorded in a basic spreadsheet that will total the frequency with which a criterion is entered. The weightings are determined based on the proportion of total.	
11.45am	Session 3 - Preparation for Workshop 2 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of Agenda for Workshop 2 2. Presentation of Options to be evaluated - clear explanation of the options that will be assessed 3. Homework - identification of information required to be presented or reviewed prior to workshop 	Keryn James Tony McRae Keryn James / All
12.00	Close	

Workshop 2 - Option Evaluation

TIME	ACTIVITY	PERSON
5.00pm	Welcome	Tony McRae, Chair, LIC
5.05pm	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recap on Workshop 1 - Agenda for Workshop 2 - Restatement of Parameters and Code of Conduct 	Keryn James, Facilitator
5.15pm	Session 1 – Presentation of Additional Information It is possible that additional information will be needed to be prepared between the two workshops. This will need to be presented by one or more participants.	To be determined
5.45pm	Session 2 – Rating of Options (6 options by 10-12 criteria) Each option will be assessed against each of the criteria for the criteria. A score of 1 –10 is given (with 10 being the best and 1 being the worst). This will be based on the participants’ review of the constraints mapping and any other information that has been provided. It is a strategic level of assessment and should not require detailed scrutiny of maps or other information.	Keryn James
6.45pm	COFFEE BREAK	
7.00pm	Session 2 – Rating of Options (continued)	Keryn James / All
7.30pm	Session 3 – Review of Option Rankings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preliminary Ranking 2. Refinement Ranking 	Keryn James / All
7.50pm	Action Plan The purpose of this session is to look at the Preferred Option and identify any risks, issues and actions required in order to progress the implementation of the Preferred Option. A review of any ‘parked issues’ that have come up in the workshop could also be conducted at this point.	Keryn James / All
8.25pm	Closing Comments	Tony McRae
8.30pm	Close	

Annex C

Alignment Options