

Division 10: Road Safety Commission, \$201 000 —

Mr I.C. Blayney, Chairman.

Mrs L.M. Harvey, Minister for Road Safety.

Mr K. Papalia, Road Safety Commissioner.

Mr T. Loiacono, General Manager, Finance.

Ms P. Reid, Principal Policy Adviser.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard. The daily proof *Hansard* will be available the following day.

It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point. The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account. Questions must be clearly related to a page number, item program or amount in the current division. It will greatly assist Hansard if members can give these details in preface to their question.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information she agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the principal clerk by Friday, 3 June 2016. I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office.

The Minister for Road Safety.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With the assistance of the clerk, I have a breakdown of each of the business cases for expenditure from the road trauma trust account with the line item expenditure amounts. Since I have been minister, it has been the custom to ensure that that is distributed as part of the estimates process.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the spending changes on page 133 of the *Budget Statements*. There is a whole list of items that, I assume, are covered on the list that the minister has sent around. There is obviously a shortfall between what is in the budget papers and what is on the minister's list. If I add up every budget estimates amount under 2016–17, the total comes to \$101 052 000, which is different from the \$146-super-duper amount that the government advertised it is spending on road safety. I assume that everything in the budget is on the list that the minister has just sent around. Is that correct?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not sure what the member for Hillarys is asking. Can the member put the question again?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will show the minister. On page 133 under road safety —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have got it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Wonderful.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Hillarys referred to page 133. Under "Total Cost of Services", the amount for 2016–17 is \$145 672 000, which is the largest amount ever spent from this fund.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, I accept that.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: If the member looks at the bottom of the paper that I have just distributed, he will see the total at the bottom is \$145 672 000, which is the same amount.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is the same amount as the total amount, but it is different from the amount for spending changes. It does not include, for instance, the money taken from the road trauma trust account that goes to the police or to the Department of Transport for collecting fines and infringements from errant motorists. That is not on the page that has just been distributed, because that totals only \$101 052 000. Obviously, it will take time to go through the paper the minister just distributed. We may not have time to analyse that properly in the hour or so we have today, which is rather unfortunate.

Notwithstanding that, on page 133, which I referred to earlier, is the line item "Improving Safety Outcomes at Metropolitan Intersections". The minister may recall that I asked a question in Parliament last week and accused the minister of misleading the house. The minister stated that \$20 million has been allocated for improving metropolitan intersections, but there is only \$10 million in this particular budget paper. At the end of question time, the minister tried to make me look silly by saying, no, there is \$10 million for other places, such as the

Stoneville and Lilydale Road intersections. The minister said that was the other \$10 million for metropolitan intersections. If the minister looks at the statement she made to the press the previous Sunday, she quite clearly stated that \$20 million had been allocated for metropolitan intersections. About two or three paragraphs after that she said that the regional road funding includes \$10 million for fixing the Stoneville and Lilydale Roads intersection. That is not a metropolitan intersection. One of her staff obviously conversed with her last Thursday and said, “We’ll get Johnson. He’s wrong. There’s \$10 million here and \$10 million there. That’s \$20 million.” The minister cannot have it both ways. She referred to the figure of \$20 million for metropolitan intersections in the statement she made to *The Sunday Times*—she gave an exclusive interview—and there was \$10 million for regional road funding for that intersection on Toodyay Road. Did the minister mislead the house last week in the answer she gave me?

[3.40 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, and I will explain it to the member again. There is \$10 million for the metropolitan intersection crash program. That \$10 million is for programs that Main Roads will put together for metropolitan intersection crashes. The detailed allocation of that \$10 million has not yet been provided by Main Roads, but no doubt that will be made available in the near future. The other \$10 million—so \$10 million plus \$10 million is \$20 million—is for the Stoneville and Lilydale Roads intersection upgrades, which is at the metropolitan end of Toodyay Road where Stoneville and Lilydale Roads intersect Toodyay Road. This priority road was included as part of the wheatbelt highway safety review, due to its high crash densities. During 2013, there were 20 serious road crashes on Toodyay Road. Five people were killed and 19 people were seriously injured. The \$10 million was allocated from 2016–17 to upgrade those Toodyay Road intersections at Stoneville Road, which is west of Gidgegannup, and Lilydale Road, which is east of Gidgegannup, which are metropolitan intersections. They do not form part of a regional roads program.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: But that is what the minister told *The Sunday Times*.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is what I have included as the \$20 million for the metropolitan intersections program because those two intersections form part of the metropolitan network, so \$10 million will be specifically allocated to those two intersections and then \$10 million will be allocated to a range of other intersections in the wider metropolitan area.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Further to that question, why did the minister tell the public in *The Sunday Times* on 15 May that road funding includes \$10 million for fixing the Stoneville and Lilydale Roads intersections on Toodyay Road? Her media people did that with *The Sunday Times*. Is it regional road funding or is it metropolitan road funding? It has to be one or the other.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As sometimes happens, the media does not always get the reporting 100 per cent correct.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister would have given that statement word for word.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is the assertion of the member for Hillarys, but I am saying to him that I was very, very clear in that \$20 million was allocated to metropolitan intersections and that was divided into two projects, one being a general metropolitan intersections program and the other being two specific projects at the intersections of Lilydale and Toodyay Roads and Stoneville and Toodyay Roads in Gidgegannup. They are metropolitan intersections. They do not fall under a regional development commission. They need to be funded because the crash history is appalling. We anticipate that, as a result of that program, we have the ability to save the lives of up to five people and save up to 19 serious injuries. It is a worthwhile project and I am very pleased to be funding it this year as part of the biggest allocation from the road trauma trust account.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: On page 138 of the *Budget Statements*, I refer to the line item “Restricted cash” under the heading “Current Assets”. Can the minister explain what “restricted cash” is? Is that the road trauma trust account; and, if not, what is it?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Restricted cash represents the value of funding held in the road trauma trust account that is available to expend on road safety initiatives. The total value of the cash is the cash assets plus the restricted cash. It is all available.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If I am clear on what the minister has said, cash assets plus restricted cash equals the money in the road trauma trust account. Can the minister advise me how much money is in the road trauma trust account today and what the anticipated balance of the road trauma trust account will be on 30 June this year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: At the end of 2015–16, the closing balance in the road trauma trust account will be \$72.195 million. The anticipated closing balance at the end of 2016–17—this is anticipating total payments from the account of \$145.672 million and receipts, as in infringement incomes, of \$110.77 million—is \$37.3 million. I will ask Mr Loiacono to please elaborate on why that specific restricted cash title is given to that allocation.

Mr T. Loiacono: The restricted cash, as the minister elaborated, is duly available to be spent on road safety initiatives. Based on the accounting definition, “restricted” lends itself to being available for only those particular initiatives; in other words, they will fund the activities of the Road Safety Commission. It is not available to spend on anything other than the commission’s initiatives on road safety.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I seek further clarification. Does all the money from speed and red-light cameras go into that fund; and, if not, why not, and where does the money go?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I believe it does. I stand to be corrected if Mr Papalia has any further information.

Mr K. Papalia: The road trauma trust account was established as a special purpose account. It is a 100 per cent hypothecation of red-light speed camera infringements. The money goes into that account. We would have to take on notice a question on the detail of the balance today because it is subject to invoicing and revenue. We would need to allocate that work to be able to tell the member what it is today. The anticipated estimates are as provided by the minister.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Just for clarification, there was reference in January this year, I think, to the balance of the account being \$140 million or \$150 million. That is why I am asking how that information appeared to have been available then. That is why I am asking what the balance is today. I would appreciate it if the minister could provide that information by way of supplementary information.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The balance that was referred to in December 2015 related to the spending changes as a result of the midyear review process, which allowed some additional expenditure from the fund. Obviously, it was a revised estimate of the income coming into the fund, with an update of what had been received by the fund up to that point. We could provide the cash balance in the road trauma trust account at the close of trade today, 24 May 2016, by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No B30.]

[3.50 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Because those two things are linked, I am still talking about the road trauma trust account balance. On page 137, under the heading “Income”, is “Road Trauma Trust Account—revenue”. I assume that represents all revenue from speed and red-light cameras. It is \$115 117 000 for 2015–16 and then that goes down in the out years. Is there any explanation why that revenue is anticipated to go down whilst the commission is in the process of purchasing more cameras?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member will see the same figure in the 2018–19 and 2019–20 years. Generally, as I understand it, these estimates are arrived at in consultation with Treasury. Perhaps Mr Papalia or Mr Loiacono can elaborate on how those estimates are arrived at to clarify that differentiation from year to year.

Mr T. Loiacono: The majority of the income shown on that line is the 100 per cent from infringement income. Also included is some interest, because the road trauma trust account attracts interest. As the balance of the account decreases, the interest is expected to decrease, so we will see a decrease. There has been a slight trend downwards in infringement income and that will be slightly offset by the number of increased cameras that come on board. However, the camera expansion for the coming year is not for a full year, and the estimates for the forward estimates period has not yet been firmed up with Treasury. That will be undertaken in the next budget process.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I note that on page 138 the money in the road trauma trust account is set to accumulate to \$176 million again in 2018–19, so it does not appear to me that the interest issue explains why there would be a diminished amount of money in the account in 2018–19 or 2019–20.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Perhaps Mr Loiacono could explain the differentiation. Obviously, there is the projected income into the road trauma trust account by way of revenue stream and then there is the balance as part of the total assets. I think the member is referring to the total assets in the fund.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am referring to the fact that the fund is being depleted to \$46 million this year by the expenditure of \$145 million, but that in each of the out years it looks as though there is no intention to spend the money because there will be an accumulation of \$113 million, then \$176 million and then \$239 million into the RTTA.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is not correct. That is because the allocations, generally, from the road trauma trust account have been done on an annual basis with a second review at midyear review, so the allocations for expenditure from the fund for the out years have not been made. All that means is that there is an anticipation of the accumulation of the funds in the absence of the allocations in the out years. What can be anticipated in the out years is obviously some of the fixed costs of the administration of the fund, for which the member can see

there is an estimate. However, project expenditure is done annually as part of the budget process, so those figures have not been populated into the forward estimates. Of course we are going to spend it.

Mr J. NORBERGER: I take the minister to the financial statements page 136. The fifth dot point under “Expenses” itemises a \$5 million spend for the wheatbelt highway safety review initiatives. Could the minister explain what the government is doing to address the recommendations made in the wheatbelt highway safety review?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have spoken a lot in Parliament about the wheatbelt highway safety review. That review looked at five years’ worth of data to the end of 2013 and into the very sad fact that almost 200 people had been killed or seriously injured in crashes in the wheatbelt. It looked at sections of Toodyay Road, Great Eastern Highway and the Great Southern Highway between Chidlow and York. Most of those crashes involved single vehicles running off the road, 29 of which occurred at intersections. A range of forums were held, there was consultation with the community and a technical assessment of the route was conducted. The review identified significant opportunities to improve the road safety environment, particularly for the wheatbelt for not only the people living in the wheatbelt, but also people travelling through the wheatbelt. It identified a lack of passing lanes and their placement, and it identified dangerous intersections. It considered also the condition and the width of the roads. It was obvious that some of the roads had challenges when there was faster and slower moving traffic in conflict and that often resulted in critical road safety issues and outcomes. As a result, \$5 million from the road trauma trust account has been allocated to provide upgrades to the wheatbelt sections of Great Eastern Highway and Great Southern Highway, and a further \$2.8 million has been allocated for project and development costs for the future upgrades of Toodyay Road. I have mentioned that sections of the metropolitan end of Toodyay Road have been included under a different funding pool. The regional end of Toodyay Road was identified as one of the worst of the three routes studied, so \$2.8 million has been allocated for project and development costs to look at what is required to improve safety outcomes on Toodyay Road, specifically the regional end.

The Great Eastern Highway road safety alliance will also be established. That collaborative model has been used successfully in other parts of regional Western Australia, which brings together stakeholders from local government, Main Roads Western Australia, the heavy haulage industry and local road safety groups to come up with localised road safety strategies that are effective in helping achieve better outcomes. Communication from the Road Safety Commission will continue to increase with the wheatbelt communities. Obviously a big job has to be done, particularly in regional Western Australia, which has had appalling statistics this year.

Ms L. METTAM: How are decisions made for funding for roads under the road trauma trust account?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Decisions are often based on things such as the “Wheatbelt Highway Safety Review” and the report by the Motorcycle Safety Review Group. Local government and Main Roads will appeal to the Road Safety Commission. The Road Safety Council will advise on areas it believes there should be expenditure on improvements for road safety outcomes. The Road Safety Council did that work previously, and it has met as recently as April. Under the new model there will be a road safety advisory council and it will identify areas of road requiring improvement. The “Wheatbelt Highway Safety Review” certainly gave us a lot of work to consider on how to improve outcomes in that particular regional part of Western Australia.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That was a very good question and it is one that I am glad the member for Vasse asked because I want to carry on from it. The minister said that the Road Safety Council met in April. When was the last time it met before that and how many times did it meet in the last six months?

[4.00 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are just trying to find that data for the member for Hillarys. It met as recently as April.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister said that, but I understand that it is not meeting as regularly as it used to. Also, what has happened to the independent chairman, which is covered under the legislation? Correct me if I am wrong—it is a question—but is Mr Papalia now the chairman of the Road Safety Council? Obviously he is not an independent chairman. He is a paid member of staff of the Office of Road Safety, or the Road Safety Commission, whatever we want to call it. He is responsible to the minister and answers only to the minister. Am I right in saying that there is no independent oversight of the government’s expenditure or of the projects that the minister agrees to undertake within the road trauma trust account by any body other than this Parliament?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No; the member is 100 per cent incorrect.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Please tell me how.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The Road Safety Commissioner was established under section 35(1)(a) of the Public Sector Management Act, which deals with the establishment of departments. That position appeared in

the *Government Gazette* on 3 July 2015. The member's assertion that the Road Safety Commissioner has no authority is incorrect. The Road Safety Commissioner —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I did not say that. I said that he is not independent.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am speaking now.

The CHAIRMAN: And I am chairing. Member, you will have an opportunity to ask further questions. Just let the minister finish.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The Road Safety Commissioner is bound by a range of statutory instruments, including the Financial Management Act. He is now subject to oversight by the Corruption and Crime Commission and the Office of the Auditor General. Also, for the first time ever, as part of the budget estimates process, the Road Safety Commissioner is in this place answering questions from the estimates committee on the expenditure from the road trauma trust account, which I think is a very high level of accountability. I would like the Road Safety Commissioner, Mr Papalia, to outline exactly what his responsibilities are pursuant to the establishment of the department and the establishment of his position under the Public Sector Management Act. The Road Safety Commissioner takes his position very seriously indeed, and the thought that his position and authority has somehow been undermined as a result of the establishment of the Road Safety Commission is incorrect. I will hand over to Mr Papalia.

Mr K. Papalia: I thank the member for the question. I would like to answer the question in two aspects—the role of the Road Safety Commissioner, and the role of the Road Safety Commission—because both aspects involve regulatory requirements that we need to meet as a department of state. We were established on 1 July 2015 as a department of state, and, as minister mentioned, we were established pursuant to section 35(1)(a) of the Public Sector Management Act. That creates certain obligations on both the commission and me as the authorised and accountable officer under the Financial Management Act.

The governance framework that relates to road safety in this state has changed markedly with the implementation of this new framework. I am happy to provide a detailed overview of the current governance framework. Our broad purpose is to harness the knowledge, expertise and interest of the community of Western Australia to reduce trauma on our roads. In order to create that, we are utilising the strategy under the state Road Safety Act, which is Towards Zero. That provides our vision and mission on the direction in which we are travelling. I refer to that because the vision and mission is contained within our code of conduct and stipulated for all our staff. That gives the broad direction.

However, underpinning our strategy are our functional requirements. When delivering on road safety initiatives in this state, we relate primarily to coordination and collaboration. We also relate to the development of intelligence, policy, research analysis, and data collection. That has been significantly challenged in this state to date, so this model is breaking new ground. We also relate to the administration of the public investment in road safety. Primarily, that relates, in part, for our focus, on the road trauma trust account and the moneys expended on that—that is specifically the public purse. Therefore, we have obligations in relation to accountability, transparency and reporting that did not exist previously in the level of detail that that obligation places on us. We also have obligations in relation to strategic communications for road safety in this state. That is more broad and looks at the whole implementation of the strategy not only the component undertaken in our program of works that is funded through the RTTA, but also the core business of major central agencies and local government authorities, through to local community groups.

Our accountability is found within the Public Sector Management Act. It is also found pursuant to the Financial Management Act, specifically part 4, and the Industrial Relations Act part VID. The commission and I are also subject to requirements under the Equal Opportunity Act. I refer to that because it also has components that relate to disability access. Previously no model was available to enable people with disabilities to access road safety in this state, and we have an obligation to fulfil the planning process to enable that. That is multidimensional. We look at our digital access and our physical access, and the opportunity to access that in regional WA. We also have obligations under the occupational health and safety legislation, and we reach out into like agencies such as WorkSafe Western Australia to understand our framework and how we can influence safety on roads and how that impacts on better outcomes for trauma on the roads. I also have obligations under the State Records Act. We are specifically required to document our processes, procedures and policies. We need to draft some 200 policies.

With regard to oversight requirements, I am specifically required to meet the chief executive officer performance agreement that I have with the Public Sector Commissioner. That is a specific oversight instruction. We also need to meet the requirements of the Treasurer's Instructions, particularly instruction 825, which relates to management policies and practices and the documentation of those practices. There is also a resource agreement between the accountable authority—that is me—the minister, and the Treasurer. We are subject to annual budget estimates processes—we are here today. We are also subject to annual reporting requirements, and we will report

Chairman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Jan Norberger; Ms Libby Mettam

this year on our performance over the year. We are subject to the requirements of the Office of the Auditor General to undertake an annual audit and a financial statement audit, and we are also subject to performance audits by the OAG, which has already visited us for that.

The CHAIRMAN: Just to keep things moving, a statement was read at the start outlining that both questions and answers are to be short and to the point. I will just ask Mr Papalia if we can get to the end of the answer.

Mr K. Papalia: Very broadly, I am subject to the Auditor General, and I am subject to oversight by the Ombudsman and the Corruption and Crime Commission. Although I have tried to provide the member with a snapshot of our governance environment, ultimately my role is to create an environment of responsibility on behalf of the minister, which is the Westminster system. My requirements are about creating an agency that recognises its obligation. Obligation to me is the willingness to be held to account and recognition of an obligation to take action. We fulfil that through the deployment of road safety. We are becoming a program management office. Those skills are developing through our people. We have a strategic workforce development plan in place. We are developing those skills and capability. Ultimately, we have far greater visibility of the program of works of the RTTA and the collaboration with the community across the state on road safety initiatives. We have published that online should anyone wish to view it, and it is available should the member want that detail.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: At the start of that monologue I had tremendous respect for Mr Papalia. I knew him very well when he was a very good police officer. However, what he has said is no different from the obligations that the Office of Road Safety had. That office came under the Auditor General, the Public Sector Management Act and all those things. Under her legislative powers at the moment, the minister is supposed to be rescinding the Road Safety Council Act. That act has a road safety committee, with an independent chairman. I believe that until the minister repeals that Road Safety Council Act, it is the act under which she has a legal obligation to operate.

I have no doubt whatsoever that Mr Papalia does a great job, but he is not an independent chairman of the Road Safety Council. I wonder where Mr Papalia is getting his expert advice from now, because the Road Safety Council used to get expert advice from all over the state, other states and internationally. It is now all done internally.

Does the minister accept that she is now cost shifting \$52.5 million from the safer roads and bridges program and the black spot program, which was always funded by Main Roads WA but is now coming out of the road trauma trust account, which it should not be doing? Does the minister accept that that is cost shifting?

[4.10 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: Before the minister answers, questions and answers should be fairly succinct, please, and also, members, please direct your questions to the relevant minister.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Hillarys is incorrect about the legislation requiring an independent chair. That does not appear in the legislation that he referred to.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, it does.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, you are wrong—it does not.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am not wrong. I have looked at it recently.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The projects that have been funded this year from the road trauma trust account are all significant road safety initiatives. Some of the projects the member is referring to from the black spot program and the safer roads and bridges program have been funded from the road trauma trust account because it is in the interests of road safety in this state to have those projects brought forward and achieved at an earlier point in time, and to reduce the fatal and serious injury crash outcomes for those projects. If the member would like to refer to a specific line item in the budget with respect to any of these projects, I am more than happy to elaborate on why we are allocating money from the road trauma trust account to ensure that we can improve those sections of roads and reduce the road toll. That is its purpose.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I respond to that? She has asked me a question. Can I just say, Mr Chairman —

The CHAIRMAN: Member, I was not quite in the chair when your first question was asked. Could you reference back to a point in the budget?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Certainly. I referenced the page and everything. I can assure the Chair that I have already done that.

The CHAIRMAN: What page was it, for my own benefit?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It was page 133, which differs from the piece of paper that the minister distributed today.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, it does not.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, it does. A moment ago the minister was asked specific things about the money from the safer roads and bridges program and black spot funding, which has always been a budget line for Main Roads. Can the minister provide the complete detail of all the different projects under the run-off-road crashes line item? There is \$65 million being spent under that section. Can the minister identify every single road and stretch of road that that money is being spent on? At the moment we have a huge global figure of \$28 million. It does not really tell us what roads that is being spent on. Can the minister supply that by way of supplementary information?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No; but I can tell the member the areas where some of these projects we are considering are. They are sections of main highways where we see these regional run-off-road crashes occur—for example, South Coast Highway, South Western Highway, Brand Highway, Bussell Highway, certainly Goldfields Highway, and Great Northern Highway. There will be audible edge lines—all those road safety treatments that I am sure the member is familiar with —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, very much so.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — and crash barriers.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister tell me where they are?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: At this point in time I am not going to —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Why not?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will just check with Mr Papalia. I am reluctant to identify every single project, member for Hillarys, simply because projects are reprioritised according to the ability and the workability of Main Roads to achieve them. Mr Papalia, could you elaborate further on the run-off-road crash program, please?

Mr K. Papalia: We have a program of works that identifies indicative treatments and the nature and type of work that is going on where. We caveat against the delivery of the program for the capacity of Main Roads and local government authorities to deliver against that. Changes do occur. Our process is one of engaging with the service delivery—that is, those who are going to deliver the service. We also have to engage with communities so that they are aware of what is going on and why that might change. The minister alluded to concerns about changes in the program. That does shift, and impact on, the expectations of the community. Part of our role is to engage with community to manage that expectation. When the program works, it is great; if there is a shift, we need to explain why and what has occurred and what the rescheduling of that priority will be. That is part of the process.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No positive program is in place at the moment with any specific roads that the minister can tell us about. We have a global figure of \$65 million but no specific areas that the minister can identify.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. If the member for Hillarys looks at business case 2, regional run-off-road program, there are “Run-off Road Crashes Road Improvements” of \$28 million; “Passing Lanes Great Eastern Highway”, \$12 million, which is a specific project; “Regional Safety Improvements—including Albany Highway Passing Lanes”, \$6.13 million; the “Wheatbelt safety review—Toodyay Road”, \$2.8 million, which I referred to previously; “South Coast Highway—widening, sealing & audible edge lines”, \$4 million; “Lake King Road (intersection with Albany H’way Arthur River)”, \$7 million; and, from the “Wheatbelt Highway Safety Review”, sections of Great Eastern Highway and Great Southern Highway, \$5 million. As I have said, a range of programs under that \$28 million fund will be announced when Main Roads is ready to start those projects to ensure that the community is informed and understands the time line for the completion of those projects.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Why is Main Roads not paying for it, as it usually does, under the safer roads and bridges and the black spot programs? Some of that comes from the federal government —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: These are all road —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: — but the minister wants to spend it out of this —

The CHAIRMAN: Member, you have asked a question; let the minister answer it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am trying to get a decent answer—an honest answer.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member would need to ask the Minister for Transport that question. I am the Minister for Road Safety and I am responsible for allocations from the road trauma trust account. We have deemed that these projects have significant road safety merit and, due to that, they are being funded—they are included in the run-off-road program business case—from the road trauma trust account. I challenge the member for Hillarys to pick one of these projects that does not have road safety merit.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister has not told me where they are.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is a list of them.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: She has just given us a global figure of \$28 million for run-off-road crashes. Give us the specific areas; then I will challenge her if I think they are wrong. I do not think they would be, but give them to me!

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further question on this line, member, because the member for Midland is next on the list?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I do not know how the minister sleeps at night, honestly.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to expense 1, “Road Safety Commission”, on page 135. I understand that new offices have been set up and so forth. I have read the “Explanation of Significant Movements”. I also, in turn, refer to the document that the minister circulated today. It has the figure \$6 077 000 under the final heading, “Informing and Mobilising Actions to Improve Road Safety Outcomes”. Under that it lists “Road Safety Commission (operations, community education, research and development)”. Firstly, I question whether \$6 million to the Road Safety Commission actually belongs under that heading because it appears to me to be largely an administration cost. That is why I have also referred to page 135. I see there are 28 full-time equivalents. Can I just clarify that that \$6 million includes the cost for all the FTEs and the costs of accommodation; and could I have a breakdown of what that \$6 077 000 represents?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: One recommendation from the Browne review was that the costs to administer the fund should be borne by the fund. That \$6 077 000 reflects that recommendation from the Browne review. Mr Papalia, are you able to elaborate on the breakdown of that \$6 million allocation?

Mr K. Papalia: It could be detailed. I will take advice on how much detail the member wants. The cost directly attributable to the establishment of the commission as an independent agency in 2015–16 was limited to \$600 000. That is for the transaction costs for our corporate services. We are moving to accommodation; we have not had accommodation previously. Part of the requirement on us, provided by the Browne report, is to decouple from any of the beneficiary agencies of the RTTA. Main Roads is a significant beneficiary. We are moving to a new location that assists with the decoupling. By the end of June we will be located at 151 Royal Street, East Perth. There are accommodation costs, but they are actually less than we currently pay so we will have a bonus outcome there in terms of reduced costs. Our employee benefits relate to \$3.5 million, which is salaries, and our accommodation costs—this is the change—will be \$410 000. Our corporate services—this is part of the negotiation with our new host agency—are \$390 000, and our business support costs are \$380 000. Our total cost of business is approximately \$4.6 million. The other costs relate to education campaigns and the delivery of service around that space, which takes it up to \$6.3 million, as articulated in the document.

[4.20 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is the difference between the education campaign referred to and the heading of “Community Education”, which is another \$4 million?

Mr K. Papalia: Within the operations of the commission we run series of grants and a number of programs for RoadWise, the School Drug Education and Road Aware program and our outreach program into regional Western Australia. We run projects on Indigenous road safety and we have an Indigenous team on board for our outreach programs. These types of costs are incorporated into those education programs. The other campaign funding—the \$4.1 million—relates to the major campaigns coming into road safety more broadly, targeting safe speed, safer vehicles and safer and road use behaviour.

Ms L. METTAM: I refer to the table on page 135, under “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators”. How is the government improving community awareness of road safety in WA using the Towards Zero strategy?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for this question. Road safety campaigns will continue throughout 2016–17, and are a really important part of the Towards Zero strategy. Mass media campaigns in 2015–16 have included those areas that we know are responsible for our fatal and serious injury crashes; that is, speeding, drink-driving, encouraging safer vehicle usage, the use of restraints—seatbelts and child-appropriate restraints—motorcycle helmets, obviously; fatigue and distraction; cycling safety; and motorcycle safety. We are moving more into the digital space by using digital strategies to engage the public on road safety topics. Obviously, a whole generation of people communicate through social media and digital platforms, and they may not necessarily see television advertisements or listen to radio stations. We have done a lot of work, and a market segmentation review is being conducted to look at those key priority areas of drink-driving, speeding, restraints and mobile phone use. That is providing us with some information on the target groups we are trying to reach, and the attitudes and behaviours we are trying to address to get better outcomes around road safety and have the community of drivers making better decisions. Those campaigns

will continue. I believe we are getting a better level of sophistication around how we target those campaigns, and we are certainly getting better value for money with some of the digital strategies we are employing.

Ms L. METTAM: I have a supplementary question. I understand there are some concerns in the Vasse electorate about drivers from other countries and keeping on the left-hand side of the road. I wonder whether that is being considered as part of an awareness campaign.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is. We run a program with a number of hire car companies that reminds drivers from other countries about the “keep left” rule in Western Australia. The Drive on Left campaign is a very important part of our program. I will ask the commissioner whether he cares to comment further.

Mr K. Papalia: I thank the minister, and I thank the member for the question. The outreach program we are running with the consular corps in Western Australia is an extended outreach. We are reaching out to other countries prior to people arriving in Western Australia to better inform them about our environment in terms of road risk, road safety rules and the road rules. They come from diverse backgrounds and different legislative backgrounds, but as part of an international convention and the treaty we recognise a valid driver’s licence. One of our risk mitigations is about reaching out before they arrive to inform them about the differences on our roads, driving in regional WA and driving in Western Australia more broadly, what our licensing requirements are and also our legislation on drink-driving and speed; seatbelts is a specific one that is a risk in regional WA. The outreach program goes from end to end, so prior to their arrival we try to provide that information and we utilise the consular corps to provide that as an established existing network. We are also engaged with Tourism, and there are some interesting solutions in that space. We are reaching out to the West Australian Indigenous Tourism Operators Council and reaching into those communities to inform them on how we can manage risk across the state. Remote driving is far different from regional or metropolitan driving in this state, and we have a significant component. There are 800 000 caravan users in Western Australia, and we are reaching out to them as an opportunity to try to mitigate risk on the road for drivers and visitors to WA, whether interstate or international.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I appreciate that the member for Vasse has had a number of horrific incidents involving international drivers in her part of the world. That is certainly one of areas we are focusing on to see whether there is more we can do.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I want to refer to the piece of paper the minister circulated earlier; I assume it is covered somewhere in the budget papers, but I cannot see it. I think that is why there is a difference between the total figure of \$146 million-and-something being spent and the amount of money actually being spent on what is purported to be road safety initiatives. There are enhanced speed enforcement administration costs of \$7 million to Police and enhanced speed enforcement administrative costs of \$4 million to the Department of Transport. That is more than \$11 million. It will come from the road trauma trust account and go to Police and the Department of Transport simply for the administrative work of sending out fines and enforcement notices. Does the minister think it appropriate for that sort of amount to come out of the road trauma trust account?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is consistent with one of the recommendations of the Browne review that the costs of administering the fund be borne by the fund. The road trauma trust account is provided each financial year to WA Police and DOT for the administrative costs of processing speed and red-light camera infringement fines. The funding allows the operation of our fixed-camera sites for close to 24 hours a day, seven days a week and 365 days a year. That funding enables the administrative functions related to the traffic infringement processing. It also includes the management, technical support, printing and posting of infringements, vehicle leases, running costs, volume-driven consumables and other operational expenses of our speed camera enforcement program. Some of that funding for the Department of Transport is to do with the Australia Post component of collecting the fees. As I said, a recommendation of the Browne review was that the costs of administering the fund and processing the infringements be borne by the fund. That is reflected as part of the fourth business case.

[4.30 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The costs are coming out of the road trauma trust account. Can the minister tell me the rationale behind the Treasurer paying \$4.931 million from the consolidated fund for increased breath and drug testing, into the road trauma trust account to simply go to the police? Why did that not come straight out of the road trauma trust account?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not sure what the member is referring to.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am basing my question on the Treasurer’s comments on road safety in the budget speech.

Chairman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Jan Norberger; Ms Libby Mettam

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Is the member talking about business case 3, the increased breath and drug testing, which is funding to WA Police of \$4.931 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Obviously, drink-driving and drug-driving are very important components of the road safety message.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, we know that, but the question was: why is it coming out of the consolidated revenue—other government expenditure—to go into the road trauma trust account to simply then go to police for carrying out increased breath and drug testing, when it has always been an expenditure from the road trauma trust account? There are millions of dollars still left in that account. The extra money could have been spent on the Quadriplegic Centre.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am looking at table 3, business case 3, increased breath and drug testing. Where is the information the member is referring to about money from the consolidated fund going into the road trauma trust account? I need help with that.

The CHAIRMAN: The advice I am receiving is that although the minister has provided that information, we still need to have a reference to a line item or dot point within the division that we are dealing with. If the member can identify somewhere that references the information he is talking about, we can continue, but it is a bit vague at this point in time, other than referencing the piece of paper that the minister has distributed.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: She has not answered the question, but it does not matter.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further on that, and bearing in mind your comments, Mr Chairman, I am wondering, given that we now have a Road Safety Commission and there is actually now a budget provision for it, why this information is not now being incorporated within the budget papers. For equivalent agencies and departments, this kind of information is listed in the budget papers. It seems to me to not be accountable to provide this as a separate piece of information, because the minister knows that it is necessary to properly consider the budget. We then had a ruling from the Chair that we are not really supposed to be asking questions about this piece of paper unless we can find a line item in the budget. As a further question, will the minister give consideration next year to incorporating this level of information—it is a simple A4 page that she has handed out today—in the budget papers, so that we can more appropriately ask questions?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will certainly take that request under advisement and seek the advice of the Department of Treasury about what is appropriately considered in the budget. If members look at the spending changes on page 133, they will see that a large amount of the information provided on table 3 is incorporated under those spending changes. My only interest is in being very transparent and providing further clarity. Part of the reason that I am so pleased this year is that we have a separate Road Safety Commission division so that we can articulate these specific programs and understand exactly how that money from the road trauma trust account is being allocated. My only consideration is whether there is any restriction by Treasury about what can or cannot be included in the budget figures, but I will certainly take that request to Treasury.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer the minister to the fact that money is going out of the road trauma trust account to Western Australia Police. According to the document the minister has provided, \$4.931 million has been provided for increased breath and drug testing, \$599 000 for the expansion of drug-testing capabilities, and over \$7 million for the enhanced speed enforcement administration costs for police. Along with the automatic speed camera enforcement strategy and speed camera placement, by my reckoning the total amount taken from the road trauma trust account is well over \$26 million. If the minister wants a line item, we can call it the income statement, road trauma trust revenue. Of the revenue that is going in, it would appear that over \$26 million is now going to support the police budget. How does that figure compare with how much money WA Police got last year? Will any of that money go towards full-time equivalents for police; and, if so, how much?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: A significant increase in funding is going towards WA Police, and that is because of the enhanced speed camera project. First, there is a speed camera replacement program. Current speed cameras have a life expectancy of seven years, and a number of those are due for replacement in the 2015–16 financial year. As they become older, they require increased maintenance.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: As a point of order, I have not asked for any detail on any of those programs. I am simply asking what the figure was that WA Police received last year from the road trauma trust account—just the actual number—and then I will be able to see how it compares with this year. I am also asking how many FTEs will be employed by the police from that massive amount of money.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will need to provide that by way of supplementary information, if that information is easily available and the commissioner can give me the nod. Does that need to be provided on notice or by supplementary?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B — Tuesday, 24 May 2016]

p163b-173a

Chairman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Jan Norberger; Ms Libby Mettam

Mr K. Papalia: Yes, it will need to be provided as supplementary information.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can provide by way of supplementary information the allocation to WA Police from the road trauma trust account last year, as compared with the allocation this year. I will differentiate between those projects, because there is an enhanced camera expansion program, there is fleet replacement, and, at the request of the commissioner, there has been a return to the road trauma trust account of some funding from last year to do with an overtime program for traffic enforcement officers. There has been some movement, with additions to expand the speed camera fleet and the replacement of the speed camera program, so I will detail the differences between last year's allocation and this year's allocation.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I also asked how many FTEs are being employed by WA Police as part of that.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, indeed; I will provide that as well. This is from 2015–16, as compared with the 2016–17 allocation.

[*Supplementary Information No B31.*]

The appropriation was recommended.

[4.40 pm]