

From: [REDACTED]
To: [CED, FOI](#)
Subject: FOI request MIS13
Date: Thursday, 25 June 2026 8:58:28 AM
Attachments: [foi-request-mis13.pdf](#)

Caution: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning please find my FOI request attached.

regards - [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information Request

Access application under the Freedom of Information Act 2016 (ACT)



FOI Officer
City and Environment Directorate
ACT Government
GPO Box 158
Canberra City ACT 2601
Email: ced.foi@act.gov.au

Subject: Access application — traffic engineering basis for the school zone sign height variation in Municipal Infrastructure Standard MIS13

Dear FOI Officer,

I am writing to request access to government information under the Freedom of Information Act 2016 (the FOI Act).

Background

ACT Government Municipal Infrastructure Standard MIS13, through ACTSD-3610, prescribes a mounting height for fold-down 40 km/h school zone sign blades that is approximately 50% and 25% below the 2-metre minimum mounting height specified in Australian Standard AS 1742.2 — Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Part 2: Traffic Control Devices for General Use. I understand the Government's stated rationale for this reduced height is to allow the sign blades to be easily folded down and back up by hand (without requiring a ladder) to mark the start and end of school terms.

AS 1742.2 (in both the 2009 and 2022 editions) permits variation from its requirements in particular circumstances, but only where such variation is based on sound traffic engineering principles and is documented. I am seeking the documentation that underpins the ACT Government's reliance on this variation provision in respect of MIS13.

I note this lowered mounting height is reportedly applied as a uniform, Territory-wide design specification — rather than as a departure adopted for a specific, justified instance. This raises a question as to whether the variation meets the “particular circumstances” and “sound traffic engineering principles” tests set out in the Australian Standard.

Information sought

Under the FOI Act, I request access to the following government information, however recorded, held by the City and Environment Directorate or any other ACT Government directorate or

agency that holds it (including any Transport Canberra and City Services records transferred under the 1 July 2025 directorate restructure):

1. Any document(s) recording the traffic engineering justification, rationale, or risk assessment relied upon when MIS13 set the mounting height for fold-down 40 km/h school zone sign blades below the 2-metre minimum specified in AS 1742.2.
2. The specific clause(s) or provision(s) of AS 1742.2:2009 and/or AS 1742.2:2022 that were relied upon, or cited, as authorising or permitting this variation from the Australian Standard's minimum mounting height.
3. Any document(s) assessing or considering the impact of the reduced mounting height on sign visibility, conspicuity, or driver detection distance for approaching motorists.
4. Any document(s) recording consideration of alternative sign designs that could meet the operational need to fold signs closed and open between school terms while retaining the 2-metre minimum height specified in AS 1742.2 — for example, a side-by-side fold-out design that would not require a ladder.
5. Any minutes, memoranda, expert reports, or correspondence relating to the decision to apply the reduced mounting height as a standard, Territory-wide specification in MIS13, rather than as a site-specific departure.
6. Any document(s) recording whether, and on what basis, the variation in MIS13 was assessed against the “particular circumstances” and “documented” requirements set out in AS 1742.2.

Time period sought: From the date in 2009 when AS1742.2 2009 was released to the present

Public interest

I submit that release of this information is in the public interest. It concerns the safety of school zone signage relied upon by motorists, pedestrians and children, and goes to whether the Territory-wide MIS13 standard is properly grounded in the sound traffic engineering principles required by the very Australian Standard it purports to apply at 1.1.4.1.

I am happy to discuss the scope of this request if it would assist in locating the relevant records, or to narrow it if the volume of documents located is significant.

Yours sincerely,

