

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES AND
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

2012–13 AGENCY ANNUAL REPORT HEARINGS

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
MONDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2013**

**SESSION TWO
OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY**

Members

**Hon Ken Travers (Chair)
Hon Peter Katsambanis (Deputy Chair)
Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Rick Mazza**

Hearing commenced at 2.35 pm

Mr IAIN CAMERON

Executive Director, examined:

Mr REECE WALDOCK

Commissioner, Main Roads Western Australia, examined:

Mr DESMOND SNOOK

Executive Director Road Network Services, Main Roads Western Australia, examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, I would like to welcome you to today's hearing. Can each of the witnesses confirm that they have read, understood and signed a document headed "Information for Witnesses"?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Witnesses need to be aware of the severe penalties that apply to persons providing false or misleading testimony to a parliamentary committee. It is essential that all your testimony before the committee is complete and truthful to the best of your knowledge. This hearing is being recorded by Hansard and a transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. The hearing is being held in public, although there is discretion available to the committee to hear evidence in private either of its own motion or at the witness's request. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session before answering the question. Government agencies and departments have an important role and duty in assisting Parliament to review agency outcomes on behalf of the people of Western Australia. The committee values your assistance with this.

Do any of witnesses wish to make an opening statement? If not, we will go straight to questions.

One of the things I am interested in trying to get a list of the projects that were funded in the 2012–13 financial year using the road trauma trust fund.

Mr Waldock: The 2012–13 financial year?

The CHAIR: Yes, the year that has just been completed.

Mr Waldock: Yes.

The CHAIR: Is there a consolidated list anywhere that goes through all of the projects?

Mr Waldock: We have a listing called "Table 5", have we not, Iain?

Mr Cameron: Yes, there is, and there will be a report each year to the Road Safety Council that provides a report on its activities to the minister, and then that is tabled in Parliament, and that will be a matter of days before that occurs.

The CHAIR: Why is that not done as part of the annual reporting processes of the agency then? Why is it done separate and later than the other annual report?

Mr Waldock: That would be a decision, I presume, for the Minister for Road Safety.

Mr Cameron: Yes, it is.

The CHAIR: But is there no way it could be included as part of the annual report of Main Roads, as the office is now part of Main Roads?

Mr Cameron: Annual report, I mean that has been the case for a very long time. Annual report generally do not have that level of details. So quite some time ago the minister and then the Road Safety Council provided an additional set of information, because the trust account projects, some of those can be very small and typically you will not see that level of detail in an annual report. So, for quite some time now there has been what is called a section 13 report, which is a report of the activities of the Road Safety Council from the road trauma trust account. So that is provided as additional information to what would normally be provided in an annual report.

Mr Waldock: And I presume too that the annual reports, if their normal time lines which are May, you would not have had all that information together maybe by then for the purpose of reporting.

The CHAIR: When money is allocated for additional policing purposes, how does the Office of Road Safety or the Road Safety Council monitor to ensure that it is over and above the ordinary everyday work of the agency that is being funded so we are actually getting additional services than we would have otherwise have got?

Mr Waldock: I will ask Mr Cameron to respond.

Mr Cameron: I need to go back one further point. In the Road Safety Council and the Office of Road Safety, we monitor the trends first, so the decisions or the recommendations to provide additional enforcement or additional road funding actually goes back to looking at the trends. Then we look at the current projects and current activities by the agencies. So there is a step before that. Once a decision is taken to recommend, ultimately if the government approves, we then require a specific set of performance indicators from those agencies. So we are very well aware that we need to be providing a value-adding or an additional component to those programs. So we have got a separate set of indicators for each project and what we are actually funding.

The CHAIR: So in terms of additional policing, will that be contained in the annual report that you referred to earlier, or will that demonstrate and show clearly how we have been able to obtain the money that you have provided, say, last year for additional policing hours? I think if broken up—booze buses and speed enforcement—will that show that there have been additional hours? Will it clearly outline how that has been achieved?

Mr Cameron: Yes. The longest standing one is the STEP program, which has been around for quite some time, and that is the strategic traffic enforcement project, and that traditionally has been for additional road safety-related traffic enforcement efforts. So the police document for us the hours and the activities that they have used the road trauma trust account money for on that. So, yes, that information is provided but it is quite specific; it is for additional traffic activity.

The CHAIR: There is another one that I am interested in. You have the money for the metropolitan intersection crashes on state and local roads

Mr Waldock: Yes.

The CHAIR: As I understand it, \$12.025 million has been allocated in this year's budget.

Mr Waldock: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do we know what projects that has been allocated for yet, what that \$12 million has been allocated to?

[2.40 pm]

Mr Waldock: I will ask Mr Snook to talk to that.

Mr Snook: Yes, we do. The projects that they are allocated for are a continuation of the Reid Highway and Lord Street, the continuation of the Roe Highway and Berkshire Road and a continuation of the Albany Highway and Liege Street. There is also some preconstruction-type

money for the Guildford Road and Tonkin Highway on-ramps, Ennis Avenue and Port Kennedy Drive, and Marmion Avenue and Mullaloo Drive.

The CHAIR: How much is there for Roe and Berkshire?

Mr Snook: There is an allocation of \$4.3 million for Roe and Berkshire.

The CHAIR: How much was allocated in the last financial year for that project?

Mr Snook: \$1.25 million.

The CHAIR: Is that \$1.25 million the spend in the last financial year?

Mr Snook: No; that was the budget that was allocated.

The CHAIR: That was the budget allocated for it?

Mr Snook: It was not spent.

The CHAIR: None of that was spent?

Mr Snook: There was a minimal amount spent on some preconstruction-type work. That funding is allocated for an at-grade intersection. Currently, Roe Highway and Berkshire Road is what we call a staggered T-intersection; the left leg and the right leg do not meet. The proposal for that overall project is valued at \$15 million. The plan is to build that as a four-legged at-grade intersection. However, that particular site comes under the effect of the Gateway WA project, so the changes in traffic due to the Gateway WA project affect that particular intersection. The Gateway WA project is looking at it to see if they can develop up a low-cost at-grade intersection—a low-cost bridge—for that site. If they can, then we could use that \$15 million as a contribution towards a bridge. At this stage, the Gateway WA project is looking to see, from a design point of view, if they can give us a suitable design that would fit within the budget.

The CHAIR: I am glad to hear the government does listen to what I say sometimes!

Mr Waldock: We are listening. The issue will be, of course, quantum. There are a few things that need to come together there. First, it would be nice to roll into the Gateway in terms of mobilisation savings, as you talked about. Early discussions have not been too promising, but, again, we are trying to simplify the intersection. We are seeing what we can do.

The CHAIR: Of the \$1.25 million from last year, how much of that was spent? You said a minimal amount. How much is carryover?

Mr Snook: I have not got that exact detail with me. I would have to take that on board, but most of it would be carried over.

The CHAIR: So that would leave just under \$10 million still to be found for that project; is that correct?

Mr Waldock: Yes, for the at-grade.

The CHAIR: For the current proposal, we are still —

Mr Waldock: Yes, \$10 million.

The CHAIR: Is that intended to then come out of future road trauma trust fund money or is it intended to come out of consolidated account moneys—general appropriations?

Mr Snook: It would be intended to come out from the next year of the road trauma trust account, so that would be the financial year 2014–15.

Mr Cameron: That will be a recommendation.

Mr Snook: Yes, a recommendation to government.

Mr Cameron: Yes, a government decision.

The CHAIR: This is what I am trying to work out. If the Road Safety Council is supposed to be working independently and making recommendations, and you get \$4 million or \$5 million of a \$15 million project allocated and there is an expectation that it will continue to be funded, how does that work? If the Road Safety Council identified it as a priority, why did they not just allocate it, getting the full \$15 million up-front and doing it over a couple of years of cash flowing?

Mr Snook: The reason is there was no way we could spend the full \$15 million in one year. So it is much better to cash flow it over a number of years and then we can use the money that is left in 2012–13 and 2013–14 on other projects. Really, it is about trying to get the maximum expenditure out on the road.

The CHAIR: If I remember rightly, Lord Street had \$2 million allocated to it last financial year. How much was allocated this year?

Mr Snook: There is \$6 million allocated this year.

The CHAIR: That gives it the full \$8 million.

Mr Snook: That is correct. As we said earlier, the anticipated completion is in the middle of 2014, so that cash flow ties in with that timing.

The CHAIR: And Albany and Liege?

Mr Snook: For Albany and Liege, there is \$100 000 in 2012–13, \$1.1 million in 2013–14 and \$2.2 million in 2014–15.

The CHAIR: So have we already allocated money for Roe and Berkshire and Reid and Lord? Reid and Lord is fully funded. How much is expected in 2014–15 for Roe and Berkshire?

Mr Snook: \$9.4 million.

The CHAIR: It is about a million-odd dollars for those preconstruction works on Guildford, Ennis and Marmion; is that right?

Mr Snook: We have allocated \$100 000 per site, so that is \$400 000 all-up.

[2.50 pm]

The CHAIR: That gets pretty close. And what about the crashes on regional roads; is there a list of those that have been funded for last year and what is prepared to be funded for this year? I suspect there is a lot more of those, so if there is a document you can table with us —

Mr Waldock: There are many.

Mr Snook: I can provide that information as supplementary information.

[*Supplementary Information No B1.*]

The CHAIR: I am just intrigued as to how those projects are identified above other road safety issues in the metropolitan area—who wants to explain to me how they —

Mr Cameron: I can do the front end.

The CHAIR: — both the urban ones and for each of the smaller regional runoffs, how they are identified.

Mr Waldock: I will let Mr Cameron kick off.

Mr Cameron: I will kick off. Back to Towards Zero and the state strategy, that is where the Road Safety Council, as I said, through the Office of Road Safety will monitor the trends in crashes and we have got an annual planning process, typically in May each year; there is an annual workshop. The Office of Road Safety presents the data and the trends. That also includes location specifics. We are looking at it by age group and road user type, whether they are pedestrians, motorcyclists, vehicle drivers. We are also looking at it by type of behaviour—speeding, drink-driving, non-wearing of seat belts. We are also looking at it by crash type. That is a more recent thing in

recent years. Towards Zero identified that the majority of our killed and seriously injured are in the metropolitan area. About two-thirds of WA's road trauma is in the metropolitan area and one-third is in the country areas. However, when you talk about only deaths, that reverses; two-thirds are in the country and one-third is on metropolitan roads. We identify the crash types and look at the regional roads and look at the deaths and identified that the single biggest crash type is a single vehicle running off a country road. The council and the Office of Road Safety have identified in terms of deaths and in terms of serious injuries where are these large areas that we need to focus our program effort. We then invite the particular agency, whether it is Main Roads or police, whichever agency we think can deliver those types of initiatives. Clearly, regional run-off road crashes—Main Roads was asked to look at that problem and identify what could be done over and above current programs. For example, we have got state and federal black spot programs and other regional road projects and metropolitan road projects. The trust fund again is not looking to replace that funding. So, then Main Roads are asked to provide a project proposal that addresses the issue of single vehicles running off the road on a country road but does not duplicate an existing program or project that they have funded elsewhere. Then the specific methodology to identify on a vast road network where you would spend additional money, that is when we would take advice from the agency—in this case, Main Roads. So, Des, over to you.

Mr Snook: With the metro intersections, we are looking to identify locations that have a higher than normal road trauma occurring at them. So, that might be what we have we had with our intersections; we do a priority ranking of intersections based on the crashes that occur. We rank that in two ways. We do it either on the number of crashes that occur and we do it on the value of the crashes that occur. By value, what that means is that for a fatality we value a fatality as so many dollars. For serious injury there is a lower value. For a minor injury there is a lower value still and property damage, damage to a car or adjacent properties, a lower value still. So, then based on those, we look at the listings and from them we look at the intersections to see if there are some treatments that we can do to treat those particular crashes. In the rankings, some of them we cannot do a treatment because something is already in the pipeline. So, for instance, the intersection of Tonkin Highway and Horrie Miller Drive appears high on the list. We will not do that because the Gateway WA project will treat that. Based on that, the Reid Highway and Lord Street has a high prevalence of crashes. Roe Highway and Berkshire has a high prevalence of crashes, so they are chosen.

The CHAIR: I accept if there is a project like Malaga or Horrie Miller, they are already in the bidding for other works. Are there any other roads that are ranked higher on your list than Roe and Berkshire and Albany and Liege? Are there roads that are not getting anything done to them that would rank higher in terms of crash statistics?

Mr Snook: There would be some that are higher. I apologise; I cannot actually tell you those without the list. Part of the reason when you choose a site is: can you do a treatment that makes a difference there? So there might be a particular intersection that has a higher prevalence of crashes, but you already have a set of traffic signals there and all the turns are controlled by red arrows. So, really, there is not a lot extra to do there to treat it, whereas in the case of Reid Highway and Lord Street, there were no signals there, so that was a good site to be able to do something. With the case of Roe Highway and Berkshire Road, one of the existing T-junctions has a set of signals, but the other does not so to bring them both together for a single at-grade intersection, you have got something there that you can treat. We are always trying to look at that as: can you do a treatment for the particular crashes? I would have to say, there are some of those intersections that are sort of higher up the list, like at Tonkin and Horrie Miller—really, it has got just about all the normal treatments on it. So, the next thing you do there is the bridging.

Mr Cameron: Grade separation.

The CHAIR: Are we able to get a copy of the ranking that you have done of the intersections and where there are roads that are higher than those, explain why they were not proceeded with?

Mr Snook: Yes.

The CHAIR: I assume you do that on each year, so if we could get what was ranked in the 2012–13 and 2013–14.

[*Supplementary Information No B2.*]

The CHAIR: Likewise for the regional roads if you could give us the same rankings.

Mr Snook: Could I give you a description of what we do for the regional run-off road crashes because that is a bit different?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Snook: What we have with the regional run-off road crashes is we have a database of all the crashes and part of that database identifies the type of crash it is. You would be aware that in the country areas, 45 per cent of the killed and seriously injured crashes are the single vehicle run-off road crashes. So, that is the highest priority for us to treat. So, we have mapped all of those crashes out on the road network and, based on the whole of the state road network, we have an average rate of crashes per kilometre and then we go through and we map the areas or lengths of road that have a higher than average crash rate for the run-off road crashes and the lengths that we choose to put the funding in for the regional run-off road crashes are those areas where the run-off crash rate is higher than average.

The CHAIR: But you do a ranking, so you can send that through to us?

Mr Snook: It is a mapping, so it will come as a map.

Mr Cameron: There is that rollover from one year to another. You might just explain that it changes.

Mr Snook: Again, that will change from year to year because both with the metropolitan intersection crashes and the regional run-off road crashes, we map a five-year average. So as we roll along, the back one comes off and the next one comes in.

The CHAIR: Looking at the figures, last year there was about \$20 million allocated to the regional run-off road crashes and I note this year you are proposing to spend \$31 million, but I assume a fair bit of that is carried over—probably about \$14 million of that is carried over.

Mr Snook: Again, if I can explain that, the initial allocations that were there in 2012–13 for the regional run-off road crashes was \$20.1 million and for the metro intersections it was \$21.6 million. But the metro intersections take a lot longer to prepare to do site inspections, do designs, do underground service relocations, whereas out in the country the regional run-off road crashes are easy to do, because the treatment is to grade the shoulders and spray a metre-wide strip of bitumen on each side and install audible edge line, and that is really easy to do. So we had a reallocation of funds. What we ended up with in regional run-off roads was approximately \$37.1 million on that. For the metro intersections we had \$4.4 million.

[3.00 pm]

The CHAIR: That is in 2012–13.

Mr Snook: It is 2012–13.

The CHAIR: How much did you spend in 2012–13 on run-off regional roads?

Mr Snook: That was \$37 million.

The CHAIR: Where does that appear in your budget papers if you spent \$37 million on regional roads? On page 389 of the *Budget Statements* you have the Office of Road Safety, you have got

\$38 million total for run-off crashes on regional roads and \$19 million for urban intersections—that is total cost—with \$12 million being spent this year. It strikes me that with the urban ones you have carried forward, but for the regional roads, the \$38 million —

Mr Snook: Sorry, Mr Chairman, what page was that?

The CHAIR: Page 389 at the very bottom of your asset investment program.

Mr Snook: That does not show all of the funding that was provided in the 2012–13 budget papers. The reason for that is that the funding in the 2012–13 budget papers was split. There were two items. One was called road trauma trust account metropolitan intersection crashes and that had \$14.219 million. The second line item was for urban intersections crash sites and has \$7.31 million. The sum of both of those is the \$21.6 million I spoke about. As you can see, on the line item at the bottom of page 389, it has only picked up the \$7.31 million.

The CHAIR: What about the run-off crashes on regional roads?

Mr Snook: With run-off road crashes there were again two line items. There was one for the road trauma trust account regional and remote road improvements and that was for \$13.3 million. The second one was for run-off crashes on regional roads and that was for \$6.8 million. The sum of those is \$20.1 million. Again, \$6.8 million is shown on the bottom of page 389.

The CHAIR: Were some of them treated as recurrent and some treated as capital?

Mr Snook: I honestly do not know why the split was; I just do not know.

The CHAIR: Why would they have been treated separately?

Mr Snook: I do not know, Mr Chairman. You can see that the current allocation on page 389 for 2013–14 is just as a single line item for each, which is what I would have thought would be more.

The CHAIR: You were saying you spent \$31 million. Where does that then show up as a completed work in the budget?

Mr Snook: I do not know, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: Would you be able to take that on notice?

Mr Waldock: Yes, we will take that on notice.

The CHAIR: I note that your minor works figure including for black spots and urgent minor works has jumped from a normal sort of \$30 to \$40 million to \$80 million, so is it possible that it could be put into minor works?

Mr Snook: That jump in the minor works I believe is a result of WANDRRA, the funding provided for disaster relief such as Buckingham Bridge and that sort of thing.

The CHAIR: So that would not explain it.

Mr Waldock: That would not be it.

The CHAIR: I thought that might have helped.

Mr Waldock: We will try to get that.

The CHAIR: In terms of last year's budget, \$13.2 million and \$13.3 million were listed under your major spending changes, which tend to be more recurrent expenditure. Then there was also the second amounts that you are referring to, which were then listed under your capital works program, the \$6.8 and the \$7.3 million, which suggest to me potentially that one is the recurrent one and one is capital.

Mr Waldock: I think you might be helping us there! I think that is probably right.

The CHAIR: Then it seems to be that all your regional run-offs have now become capital. It gets me completely confused, which is not unusual for the budgets of this state!

Mr Snook: I apologise for that.

Mr Cameron: The information I have is that it is a capital–recurrent issue.

Mr Waldock: If we had had our financial person here, we might have had an answer for you.

[Supplementary Information No B3.]

The CHAIR: Is it correct that of the \$30 million, about \$10.5 million is on the York to Quairading Road?

Mr Snook: The York to Quairading Road is \$10.5 million over a three-year span, so it is not a single \$10.5 million in one year.

The CHAIR: I am just trying to work that out that. How has the minister then made an announcement that there is \$10.5 million going to be spent on a road if it has not been recommended by the Road Safety Council, because they do it on an annual basis?

Mr Waldock: I think there is a recognition that when it is a capital project, there is an expectation that it will be carried forward. Clearly, every year they want to lock in total budget allocation, so these are the legacy issues that would roll over as the recommendation.

The CHAIR: Does the Road Safety Council recommend it in that term or did they only recommend a smaller amount, and it is a cabinet decision to announce the \$10.5 million?

Mr Waldock: My colleagues sit on the Road Safety Council.

Mr Snook: The Road Safety Council only recommends an annual budget.

The CHAIR: So what we then have is an announcement by cabinet about an amount that has not even had a recommendation come before it from the Road Safety Council yet? Is that correct?

Mr Snook: Correct.

Mr Waldock: There is a clear implication that if there is a capital project to be rolled over, that would be part of it, I am sure.

Mr Snook: Yes, technically correct.

The CHAIR: If it is a clear implication, I would have thought it might be included in the recommendations.

Mr Waldock: So might have I.

The CHAIR: Is it possible to get the recommendation that was considered for these matters by the Road Safety Council? Is it something we could ask for?

Mr Waldock: I think there might be cabinet-in-confidence.

Mr Snook: I am not sure.

The CHAIR: I will ask for it anyway and you can come back to us and tell us whether you think it is cabinet-in-confidence. I am asking for what the original recommendation was in respect to those projects by the Road Safety Council.

[Supplementary Information No B4.]

Mr Cameron: It is the Road Safety Council. It is an annual recommendation and it is not project-by-project specific, so the council is looking at how much we need to do in each of these spaces and then the agency is identifying the priorities and convincing the council of the method to do that. The council is not going project by project as such.

The CHAIR: Which makes it even more complex in terms of the director general's comments that there is that disconnect that the Road Safety Council is looking at annual allocations, but the other arm of government is clearly saying, "We're going to continue to fund this through this project." I

do not expect any of you to comment on this, but it makes this a bit of a conflict in terms of what are expected to be recommendations of an independent body.

Mr Waldock: I do not think “disconnect” was my term, Mr Chairman!

The CHAIR: But if you could explain to me how it is not disconnected, you are more than welcome to, if you feel you can!

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Can I come to the road trauma trust account and police enforcement hours? Can you explain to me how those recommendations in relation to police enforcement hours work and how that money is allocated?

[3.10 pm]

Mr Cameron: As I was saying earlier, the council’s interest in the Office of Road Safety is looking at crash trends. From the top, we go back to the strategy and we know that we have risk-taking behaviours including speeding, drink driving, drug use, not wearing seat belts et cetera. What the Office of Road Safety does, and the council considers, is how we are trending with alcohol related fatalities, drug related fatalities, seat belt offences et cetera. We want to reduce those types of crashes, so our primary response, based on the evidence, would always be an enforcement response, and then what we do in my office applies to funding for campaigns to back that up. We need the police response and then we back that with an educative response as well. Again in the area of drink driving, drug driving and speed enforcement, the council then invites proposals from the police in which they identify what they will be doing with the additional money that they get from the road trauma trust account. As I said earlier, one of the oldest examples is the STEP program which then provides additional hours and they give us a breakdown of those additional hours and what results they have from those additional hours. We monitor that across performance. The impetus is again coming from us identifying the trend with alcohol related crashes or speeding. We have to identify that enforcement is the best response in the first instance, and then police are asked to do it.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: That would dictate the increase or the relative decrease in enforcement hours.

Mr Cameron: That is correct. I should fill in a bit more detail. We have five priority business cases that we are looking at recommending to the government to implement for zero strategy. We were moving this way prior to the 100 per cent hypothecation coming through, but international best practice, like other areas of government and enterprise, is focused on getting results. We have identified five result areas; that is, regional run off crashes or run off crashes; urban intersections, which we have talked about; impaired driving crashes, which is a combination of alcohol and drug use; speed related crashes; and our fifth one is occupant protection vulnerable road users. We are looking to get results in those five areas and then we look at the evidence of what are the best responses. For the run off crashes it is an engineering response, for intersections an engineering response, for impaired driving it is an enforcement response and for speed related crashes it is an enforcement response backed up by driver education. The fifth one, occupant protection and other users, is at the moment primarily funding crash testing through the ANCAP program nationally and also some publicity and attention to encourage people to buy safer vehicles. We are really focusing on five result areas based on the crash problems that we have and we are funding additional efforts in agencies to try to get a better and quicker result. Towards Zero is a 40 per cent reduction in killed and seriously injured by 2020. They are all people, but we are targeting to get the biggest reductions in numbers as quickly as we can. Those five priority business cases will evolve. If we are very successful in reducing run off road crashes—it will take us some time because it is a big job—eventually we would expect that we will stop putting so much effort into that if we have been able to reduce those types of crashes.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Have police enforcement hours increased significantly since the last budget?

Mr Waldock: I do not think it has. It has gone from \$7 million to \$7 million—it is the same.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: It is about the same as 2012.

Mr Cameron: The trust account is only looking at the additional distributed funds. Police hours more broadly might be different, but the trust fund is only looking at what we fund to do and that has been pretty much the same in the past two years.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: It has been the same for the past two years; okay.

Mr Waldock: Since it became when all speeding inputs go into revenue.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: That is all I have on police enforcements, but I want to come back to black spot funding.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I have some questions around police enforcement, but also generally around some of the statistics before we get to police enforcement. Mr Snook used the figure of 45 per cent in relation to single vehicle run off deaths. Is that 45 per cent of all road deaths in WA?

Mr Snook: That is deaths in regional areas.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: In regional areas. Because page 51 of the annual report states that 60 per cent of all road deaths and serious injuries in regional and remote WA come from single vehicle run off road crashes. I just want to clarify the figures.

Mr Waldock: I thought it was 60 per cent of all crashes. The number of people killed or seriously injured in run off road crashes for 2012–13 was 60 per cent regional and 40 per cent metropolitan.

Mr Snook: I do apologise.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: That is all right; no matter what it is because I realise that there are different statistics. It is a pretty significant figure. Do you break down the single vehicle run off road crashes—I understand that this is not an exact science—into areas where you measure or find information about where alcohol was involved or speed was involved or a combination of speed and alcohol were involved?

Mr Waldock: Oh yes.

Mr Cameron: Yes; we want to stop the crashes. Whatever the cause, we still want to stop the crash. It is an important distinction and we do work backwards and look at the behavioural practices. We will look at alcohol because that is determining whether or not we should be pursuing a police response, for example, versus an engineering response. We are looking at all of those contributing factors in terms of behaviour. One of the hardest ones to assess is fatigue because the validity and reliability of those measures is very difficult. Increasingly I make the comment that we are looking at getting results. We are trying to reduce the number of crashes where a single vehicle runs off the road and results in a serious casualty. We do know and we do look at the split, yes.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: What percentage of single vehicle run off road crashes would be attributed to speed?

Mr Cameron: I will need to get that information and that split for you.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I would appreciate that. Also the same with alcohol, a combination of speed and alcohol and maybe include drugs other than alcohol in that as well.

Mr Waldock: I can say that there has certainly been decreasing evidence of driver or rider alcohol levels in recent times. I am not sure of the absolute percentage.

Mr Cameron: I cannot give you an absolute percentage, but I can give you an example that highlights one of the reasons that we are recommending an engineering response. For some time we have been looking at five-year data across the regions and typically that is showing us that about 30 per cent of single vehicle run off crashes that result in killed or seriously injured are due to a

primary risk-taking behaviour—alcohol or seat belts or speeding. What that is telling us is that we have some risk-taking behaviour, but we also have crashes occurring for a lot of other reasons. We are happy to get you the split and the actual percentages, but I think the important point, the one that we carry, is that about 30 per cent of our KSI—killed and seriously injured—on those regional run off crashes are due to what we would call primary illegal risk-taking behaviour. Perhaps 60-plus per cent are not. They are running off the road due to other factors.

[Supplementary Information No B5.]

Mr Cameron: We will give you that breakdown by alcohol and seat belts.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Do you guys have any input into where police enforcement action takes place?

Mr Waldock: No. Ian?

Mr Cameron: I agree! The answer was correct which is why I did not say anything. We need to get a reduction in alcohol related crashes. It is then the advice from police, as it is with Main Roads, as to where they need to go first to get those results. We are less inclined to dictate to an agency how you should achieve that, providing the agency is demonstrating their approach is consistent with the evidence that we are aware of. So, police will target; we need them to get a reduction in alcohol-related crashes.

[3.20 pm]

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Quite clearly, a lot of our—how did you describe it—KSI?

Mr Cameron: Killed and seriously injured, yes.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: So a lot of our killed and seriously injured are happening in —

Mr Cameron: You have got to be careful; they are people that are being killed or seriously injured.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Given the discrepancy of populations between Perth metropolitan and regional WA, this is a serious regional problem.

Mr Waldock: Massive.

Mr Cameron: And for death, particularly, there are much bigger numbers in the metropolitan area for killed and seriously injured when you add them together.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: So, would there not be some strong, at very least, anecdotal evidence to suggest that police should target a lot more of their enforcement—speed and alcohol enforcement—in rural areas than they are doing at the moment?

Mr Waldock: Well, I think that is true. The latest information coming through is that there is a 13 per cent decrease in KISs for the 2012–13 in regional run-off-roads and a 17 per cent decrease in head-on collisions in regional roads. So, I think one could argue anecdotally the stories of good trends coming through. We have run some regional seatbelt campaigns, which have been very successful, because certainly there is well and truly a disproportionate amount of people dying by not wearing seatbelts in the regions. I think there is some good evidence for all of that, so the real issue is whether the police should be more proactive.

Mr Cameron: But then again it comes back to the issue between death and seriously injured; the strategy is about the total figure of killed and seriously injured. The majority of the killed and seriously injured are occurring in the metropolitan area.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: But a significantly disproportionate percentage—45 per cent by some measures—is happening in rural areas. You would expect on the figures that 80 to 85 per cent of all deaths and serious accidents should be happening in the metropolitan area, based on population.

Mr Waldock: You are quite right. I guess one of the issues the police will have to come to terms with, and I am sure they do, is just the vast nature of our regional areas—18 000 kilometres of main roads for a start. It is a very large area to ensure compliance.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I understand, but obviously a lot of this funding is coming from enforcement activities, so it puts you in an invidious situation. But a speed camera on the Mitchell Freeway picking up people doing 105 or 107 kilometres an hour may be ticking over the tills, but a speed camera out in the middle of Great Eastern Highway may focus drivers both on the speeding aspect but also on concentration if they are aware that there would be more targeted speeding activities. So, if we are really looking at bringing this serious problem under control, I would question how much of our enforcement is being spent in areas where we are not going to make much of a difference.

Mr Cameron: So then you have got the type of method in terms of the enforcement, as well, whether that is a patrol car. Depending on the density, the metropolitan area is high-volume roads, multi-lanes, the fit-for-purpose tool is a speed camera that you have just referred to, whereas on rural highways and approaches like that, you would have a different police response to those. As I say, the difference there is volume and multi-lane. So, it is having the right tool for the right job.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Volume again sounds like revenue collection.

Mr Cameron: No it is not, no. In terms of strategy, speed enforcement, there is a rule of thumb internationally that if we step right back from the detail, every one per cent change we get in travel speed on the network has a fourfold impact on road trauma. As network travel speeds go up by about one per cent, we would expect a four per cent increase in deaths. If it drops by one per cent, we will get a fourfold decrease in deaths. So, that is an international rule of thumb. We are monitoring that. So, a little bit of speed across the network—we obviously need to target the high risk-takers, the extreme speeders, they are at high individual risk of causing a crash—but we do have a problem with encouraging the entire road-using population to slow down. That is not a Western Australian issue; that is an international issue where the one per cent–four per cent holds up. The one per cent–three per cent is basically in relation to serious injury. So, we do need to be targeting, we have run campaigns in past years, five kays does make a difference and it does across the road network.

Mr Waldock: Look, I understand the complexities of this, but certainly the fact is that we are putting so much money into regional run-off crashes in an engineering sense, with seemingly some positive results to date, with audible edges and with wider shoulders and where necessary barrier systems. I think we are seeing the regions as, if we can, engineering solutions, because I think compliance is still not without its issues in the country area, just, again, the vast distances. Certainly, you could put speed cameras out there, but you are talking about not very large volumes.

Mr Cameron: Police are enforcing; we can only talk about the road trauma trust account bid for the additional priorities. So, regional policing has a regional response. If police ever make a case for additional funding from the trust to do additional effort and we can identify a benefit we will get, that would come before us. But at the moment, police have not identified that. They are enforcing, with the budget that they have, the additional effort. But some of that STEP funding and that for the additional enforcement effort is regional, so the STEP funding is not just metropolitan. So, there is additional funding from the trust going into regional enforcement, but that is what police have identified they can do an additional job with. In the regional areas, that is typically funding additional traffic hours for them to do extra work. But there is a limit to what police can do with that because they have got X number of people in those regional areas and there is only so much additional work that they can actually do.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Audible edge lining—how much more expensive is that than normal edge lining?

Mr Snook: Yes, it is significantly more expensive. I have not got the actual dollars per metre, but because it is made of what we call thermoplastic, rather than just the paint from ordinary white lining.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: And how much of it is there in WA? Do you keep statistics of how many kilometres of it do you have or what percentage of the total road network you have?

Mr Snook: I could get that. Certainly, the audible edge lining is an important part of the treatment that we are currently rolling out through the road trauma trust account for the regional run-off crashes.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Can you provide figures of how many kilometres have been laid in each of the last five years, for instance?

Mr Snook: Yes.

[Supplementary Information No B6.]

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Do you use that in the metropolitan area as well?

Mr Snook: Yes, we do. We have used it on sections of Kwinana Freeway; towards Safety Bay Road, there are sections of it there.

The CHAIR: And Yanchep road—what do you call it there now—Yanchep, Wanneroo, Indian Ocean Drive.

Mr Snook: Yes, it is Indian Ocean Drive—Wanneroo—Lancelin—Perth—Lancelin road.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I pass up there quite a lot.

Do you use it in more metropolitan roads, more inner-city roads, to delineate separation, say, between bike lanes and road lanes—things like that?

Mr Snook: We use it mainly in the country areas. The issue about using it in the metropolitan areas is the noise that the tyres make when they hit it. For people who live along the road, it is actually a real irritant.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Okay, I have only noticed it from inside the car, of course, not from outside.

Mr Cameron: It does make a lot of noise!

Mr Waldock: And I do not think cyclists like it very much either.

Mr Snook: Yes, that is right; we have had some feedback from cyclists.

The CHAIR: They would prefer more permanent barriers to keep the cars away.

Just on that whole issue of treatments, the wire barriers, what work has been done on their safety for motorcyclists, I mean, compared to other treatments?

Mr Waldock: There is a story there.

Mr Snook: A lot of work has been done with wire rope barriers. It certainly is seen as a very good treatment for cars because the wire rope barrier, when it is hit by the car, it bends and so it absorbs the energy. For motorcyclists, issues have been raised about the fact that the wire rope barrier will cause severe injury to the motorcyclist. However, any sort of barrier is likely to do that. Say, for instance, if you have got a concrete barrier and the motorcyclist hits that, that is like hitting a brick wall. There will be damage either way. At Main Roads we are part of a national study at the moment to look at treatments that we might be able to do to the wire rope barrier to make them a little more forgiving in collisions with motorcyclists. That has been going on for a few years now. As I said, it is a national study through one of the universities in the eastern states.

[3.30 pm]

The CHAIR: You are saying anecdotally, so there is the sense that you are hit. But, depending on the angle, if you hit a concrete barrier you might bounce on down the road, for want of a better term, but if you hit the wire I can think of some horrible mangling of someone on a motorbike. Have any studies been done on the difference in the safety treatment of the different methods—concrete, hard, steel barriers versus wire barriers?

Mr Snook: Yes. Studies have been done on concrete barriers, on the W-beam barrier, which is another name for the Armco and the wire rope barriers. There are problems with all the steel-type barriers that have a separate post. They all have the opportunity to cause problems but, as I said, there is no give in a concrete barrier when a body hits it. That can cause significant problems.

The CHAIR: There is a potential give for the wire barriers on the body, although there is the danger of catching part of the body.

Mr Cameron: With a vulnerable road user at speed, as Mr Snook said at the start, any of those barriers will be problematic, at the end of the day. The road authorities are putting in the barrier considering the opportunity cost. In other words, what would happen if that barrier was not there? It could mean that the motorcyclists would be in front of oncoming traffic or were down an embankment or among trees. Any barrier is a hazard in itself but they weigh up the greater opportunity cost behind the barrier for motorcyclists and other road users.

The CHAIR: Motorcyclists are specifically considered in that opportunity cost equation?

Mr Snook: They are part of the consideration; it is motorcyclists and other vehicles.

Mr Cameron: The other considerations are how close the barrier is. Main Roads and the other road authorities are looking at that. Sometimes at speed, because of the cornering characteristics of the bike, the motorcyclist will corner or use a bit more of the road surface, so some work has been done internationally on that: where do we put the barrier and how close is it to the roadside; how much forgiveness do we provide? We have to be careful with that. If the barrier is too far away we change the potential angles of impact.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: In some instances on some roads, for example the Mitchell Freeway where some has been added, I have had discussions with motorcyclists who have suggested that moving the barrier closer to the train line, for want of a better term, would at least allow someone who falls off a motorcycle to slow down a little before hitting the barrier; whereas the current wire barrier is placed in close proximity to the emergency lane on the right-hand side, so they would hit at a fairly great speed. I do not know; I do not have any technical knowledge in this area, but has any consideration been given to putting the barrier further away from the road surface itself?

Mr Snook: We have put the barrier in according to the standards. The issue we have with where the wire rope barrier needs to be is that if it is a car, we do not want it going down a drain or going up a rise when it hits the wire rope barrier because, depending on the trajectory of the car, it has the risk of riding either over or under the barrier. We have put them in standard locations.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Can we get a list of the 141 projects funded under the state black spot program in addition to the 43 funded under the federal black spot program?

Mr Snook: What year—2013–14?

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Yes. Is it possible to get a list of what is coming up?

Mr Snook: The national black spot program is done on a year-by-year basis.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Calendar year?

Mr Snook: No; it is done on a financial year basis and we go through a set criteria with that. There should be a copy with the 2013–14 national black spot program on the Main Roads website but we will provide that separately.

The CHAIR: I think they have provided us with the 2012–13 in questions on notice.

Mr Snook: For Main Roads. I thought the state black spot program was on our website, but I will make sure we provide it as supplementary.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: As well as the commonwealth?

The CHAIR: There is a comprehensive list of all the money spent under the completed works and minor works, including black spots and urgent minor works and there is a column that identifies whether it is black spot and whether it is commonwealth funded.

Mr Snook: I can provide another copy that is a bit easier to follow.

The CHAIR: Which is the standalone ones on your website.

[Supplementary Information No B7.]

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: As well as the projected?

The CHAIR: You will have 2013–14, but do you have 2014–15?

Mr Snook: No; on both the state black spot program and the nation-building black spot program we do an annual nomination list, so I am not able to provide the 2014–15 proposals.

The CHAIR: The 2013–14 will be.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: When do they go in?

Mr Snook: We have already called for nominations for 2014–15. We will go through a process early next calendar year. Then both of those programs will be announced as part of the next year's budget process.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: It is good to understand the process; thank you.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: I cannot recall exactly, but there seems to be a bit of a concerted campaign about drivers using their mobile phones. I am not sure whether that is coming from the Office of Road Safety, the RAC, police or a mixture of all. It seems to me that the police are targeting drivers using mobile phones. When I am in Perth I drive up the freeway from the south each morning and put a lot of the congestion on the freeway down to police on motorcycles pulling over drivers on mobile phones and causing congestion on the freeway.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Everyone else slows down to 70 to look at them.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: Or less!

What evidence is there that we are changing behaviour by fining people who use their mobile phones rather than looking at other strategies? Something I have contemplated—I do not know whether other jurisdictions are considering such a strategy—is if you get caught using a mobile phone by a police officer, you are fined \$200 or \$250 for using that device, but if you fit an approved car kit or cradle into your vehicle to allow you to use your mobile phone whilst driving, perhaps the fine can be removed as a result of you installing that car kit. I have touched on quite a few areas there, but I would be interested in your comments. I have touched on quite a few areas there, but I would be interested in your comments.

[3.40 pm]

The CHAIR: I thought you were going to recommend confiscating the phone, as well as the fine.

Mr Cameron: Mobile phones are a road safety issue. They are one of the key sources of distraction. There is evidence there on the physical use of a phone. The rules we have, or the traffic laws we have, are Australian road rules, so Western Australia is consistent with the other jurisdictions. Western Australia is also consistent with the other jurisdictions in terms of the combination of approaches. So there is an enforcement effort, and, as you say, from time to time police will conduct a particular sort of enforcement effort just to keep reminding drivers, and there

are various education materials. Before the laws changed a number of years ago, we did primarily just go with educative responses; we also had the encouragement for people to be fitting those devices you referred to. But then all jurisdictions, including WA, went further down and we changed the traffic laws as a result. So WA is not inconsistent with the others in terms of the approach. I have not seen any jurisdiction doing what you suggest in terms of its effectiveness; we would need to look at how effective that would be and how easy that would be to implement as well.

Mr Waldock: To enforce.

Mr Cameron: Yes, and enforce. Essentially, this approach now is consistent with the other jurisdictions and does follow a number of years when we used educative responses. We have worked with the telecommunications industry as well to encourage people to be fitting them, and the retailers ran concerted efforts. It is an interesting suggestion, but we are not sure whether that, I guess, would have any additional effect on top of what is already being done.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: But I guess the basis of my question is how do we assess the effectiveness of a measure. I guess in this instance the measure is a pretty hefty fine, and I think that police certainly are targeting motor vehicle users who are stuck in congested freeways in morning traffic travelling at 20 to 40 kilometres an hour and think it is an opportune time to ring grandma for a chat. Is there any way of measuring whether or not that strategy is effective, whether or not those police resources are making a difference, whether those \$200 fines are changing behaviours, or whether it is just something that is consistent with all other jurisdictions so we will continue on down that path?

Mr Cameron: I think the reason it is consistent with the other jurisdictions is because that is, I guess, the experience and evidence we have so far of the best effective responses. The ultimate response is probably a technology one, ultimately, where the interface between the phone and vehicle and the movement speeds and that and the technology will intervene. We could probably do that now, but community acceptance is probably not there for that. Seatbelts is another example where we continue still to rely on enforcement and an educative response. When I say “educative”, we are doing programs in schools, right through to the mass media. But there again you could probably have a technology-based solution. We have reminders in vehicles now to remind you to buckle up. Ultimately, if you wanted to stop 99.9 per cent of seatbelt crashes, you could probably have some sort of device that intervened before you were able to drive the car. Similar with a mobile phone: the vehicle interface could actually provide the driver with some safety feedback about when it is appropriate or safe to use it when a vehicle is stationary or parked or whatever. So as a broad comment: the reason we are consistent with the other jurisdictions is because ultimately probably there are technology solutions. That is not a technology impediment; it is probably a community acceptance impediment in the first instance. Until then, we are left with in this space of the best responses are an enforcement backed with an educative response.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: Has there been work done on linking the use of mobile phones to vehicle accidents?

Mr Cameron: Yes.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: How does that rate in terms of how significant a factor that is when you consider all the other things such as driving under the influence, speed, seatbelts et cetera. Well, seatbelts not as the cause of a crash, but driving under the influence and speed and driver decision.

Mr Cameron: Yes, distracted driving, of which mobiles phones are a contributing factor, is a significant emerging issue. In the data we are seeing at the moment from most jurisdictions the estimates vary, but we are probably beginning to estimate around 30 per cent of serious crashes involve an element of distraction. That distraction obviously is a lot of factors, the mobile phone being one; turning to attend to the kids in the back seat; to change a CD; to have a sip of coffee; to

brush your hair; to do all those other sorts of thing that do happen in motor vehicles that cause distraction. Our message around distraction is that the mobile phone is part of the distraction message. There is a fair bit of international evidence around that, and science, and it has been looked at a number of times by various international bodies. The mobile phone—certainly the physical hand-holding of a mobile phone—is a significant contributor to distraction crashes, but that does not mean it is the only source of distraction. As the evidence firmed up and got stronger, that is why most jurisdictions, including WA, moved to more than just an educative response; we moved to a traffic law and then an enforcement response. We need to have enough evidence to justify those moves in the community and to government, and there is enough in that to do that. So with the mobile phone one we did, we have often been asked, “Why don’t you do it for a lot of other things?” Well, the evidence is probably not there as strongly for those others, whether it is reading a book or, as I said, brushing your hair—there are all sorts of distractive behaviours.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: But there are aspects of the traffic code that a driver could be charged under if you were balancing a meat pie while driving with your knees down the freeway?

Mr Cameron: Yes, correct. Then we would need to look at things like ease of enforcement or practicality as well. So certainly as you are saying, the police would need to gather additional evidence, and those other things could be. Whether they are able to do that, whether they are able to gather enough evidence to make that likely to be a successful prosecution, the police have to weigh that up all the way through. In relation to the mobile phone, given that there was enough evidence, given that the traffic laws have changed, and the laws we have tinkered with—they have changed slightly recently—to enable the ease of or consistency of enforcement to be applied across Australia.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: This might be more of a question for WA Police, but given the number of cameras we now have, particularly forward-facing cameras, if a driver is flashed through an intersection at speed or on the freeway or just travelling along the road and they are using a mobile phone in the picture, would they also be charged for that offence?

Mr Waldock: I do not think so.

Mr Cameron: I am not aware of that occurring; that would need to be checked with police. It has been raised in the past, but I am not aware that police are using photographic infringements for anything other than a red light or a speed-related offence.

Mr Waldock: I am not sure it has the resolution anyway, has it?

Mr Cameron: No, the digital imaging has changed all that. For example, it came up a number of years ago when questions were asked about could you do it for seatbelt offences.

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: There was an article recently in, I think, *The West Australian* about drivers dodging offences, and therefore demerit points, to maintain their driver’s licences, and they were talking about using the camera technology to identify the person. I assume if they can identify a person from the —

Mr Cameron: Correct. If they can —

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: — image that has been taken, they would be able to identify the device on their ear.

The CHAIR: It depends on the shot though.

Mr Cameron: It would depend on the shot, and as I say it has been talked about before in the past in relation to seatbelt fences—for example, someone not wearing a seatbelt. But I am not aware that police are using that method to do any enforcement at this stage. You would need to get a question to the police on that.

The CHAIR: I got a number of stats recently about the number of road deaths on a number of our country highways, and I am just interested to know what work is done to identify, when there are road deaths on our highways, whether it was driver error or whether it was the road performance, and how is that being dealt with. Obviously one of ones was the North West Coastal Highway, which struck me, for the volumes and the distances, to have very high numbers.

[3.50 pm]

Mr Waldock: Was that the truck driver?

The CHAIR: Over the last four years, there have been 20-odd fatalities—seven, five, three and eight. That is a fairly consistent high number. Every road is slightly different. The South West Highway is relatively high as well. I am intrigued to know what work is done after each road fatality to try to identify whether it had something to do with the design of the road and what can be done rather than just driver error.

Mr Snook: After every fatality, at Main Roads we do a fatal crash investigation. Our work is specifically targeting if the road contributed to the crash because police will do the official fatal crash investigation. They consider everything. We only go near it and look at the road issues. We build up a picture from that, if the road was at fault. That information is part of a report that goes to the coroner for each of those crashes.

The CHAIR: Is that publicly available? As a result of that work, do you create a list of priority areas that need to be addressed as a result of previous road crashes?

Mr Snook: As I said, it goes to the coroner. Until it goes to the Coroner's Court, it is under his control. Out of that investigation, if there are things that we believe should be improved on the road, they are put together as a list of improvements. Say, in the case of the North West Coastal Highway, that would go to the regional manager and that would be what he would use for any funding applications.

The CHAIR: Is there a list of priority treatments as a result of fatalities on our roads consolidated anywhere or is it given back to the local managers to feed in as part of the annual budget process or is there a central reservoir of that information to say, "These are the areas where we've had more than one accident and there is clearly an issue that if we do not fix that road treatment, there will be another?"

Mr Snook: Yes, the information goes to the regional manager. He can use it for a submission. The number of crashes that appear on the road all goes into the big database. When we go through and we do things, as I have described previously with the road trauma trust account about how we map out those lengths of road that have higher than average crashes, it gets picked up through that. There are sections of the North West Coastal Highway through the safer roads program where we are widening the road. All of that information contributes to the case being made for funding to go to those roads.

The CHAIR: Is there a list of those that need urgent works?

Mr Snook: No, it is more an ongoing list of priority sections rather than a list of urgent roads that need attention.

The CHAIR: What do you expect to be the income for the road trauma trust fund for this financial year? I note you got about \$93 million into it last year.

Mr Cameron: That is a revenue question. Are you asking about revenue coming in?

The CHAIR: Yes—receipts that will go in. I assume that is interest on the money that is already there—fines that are collected by the Department of Transport.

Mr Cameron: It is \$91 million.

The CHAIR: At the moment you are only allocated \$76 million of expenditure.

Mr Waldock: Yes.

The CHAIR: Will we see a further increase in the surplus?

Mr Waldock: Yes, unless other projects are funded during the period.

The CHAIR: It is a shame Mr Chown is not here because he may be the better one to answer it. There is \$64 million sitting in the account at the moment. If you add another \$15 million to it, up to \$80 million will be sitting in the road trauma trust fund. Surely there are projects and things we could be spending that on. I think the Road Safety Council recommended \$104 million in expenditure this year.

Mr Waldock: That is correct.

The CHAIR: Can you tell us why that money is not getting spent?

Mr Cameron: There are a number of factors. Because it is a cash flow—in other words, we have to have the revenue coming in—it is not a budget allocation. The best way to explain it is that in the year that it went from one-third to two-thirds, the Road Safety Council had already recommended a budget and the government and the council went with the one-third budget which meant for that first year, we are banking an additional one-third. Part of the decision-making around that was that we were anticipating funding road projects. The trust traditionally did not have enough in the budget to do that. Last year Main Roads advised us in the first year, 2012–13, of the 100 per cent. We took advice from Main Roads about how quickly it could initiate and how much it could spend on a regional run-off road program in the first year. The methodology that Mr Snook identified before and the process of allocating that funding to projects that would make a difference, Main Roads told us that it could spend a certain amount of money. The council then recommended the budget accordingly.

That is the history of why we have got to the point where we are so far. As Mr Waldock said, the minister has previously stated that before matters become budget matters, there are policy considerations that the minister would like to take before cabinet and government for consideration. If the government chooses and makes a decision to fund some of those additional policy initiatives, there are funds in the trust account to enable that to occur.

The CHAIR: A significant sum seems to be building up there. The recommendation of the Road Safety Council is \$49.35 million for regional and remote road improvements and only \$31 million has been approved. I assume that Main Roads had \$49.3 million worth of projects it could have got on with this year had that money been approved.

Mr Snook: Yes, that particular line item is a balancing line item. That means that the allocation is made to all the other line items and then whatever is left goes into that area.

The CHAIR: Would you have projects worth \$49 million that you could progress this year had you been given the funding on regional roads to improve road safety?

Mr Snook: Yes. It would have been a very big task for us to do it, considering the quantum of that funding. If we had early enough warning, we could have done that.

The CHAIR: Are we able to get a list of the projects that have not been able to be funded as a result of not having that money approved?

Mr Snook: That goes back to the particular map that I spoke about that has the highlighted lengths of roads. We had developed a program from the \$31 million. I have not developed a program for the \$49 million because I will only develop that with the regional managers from Main Roads once we know the quantum of dollars.

Mr Waldock: The map should show you.

The CHAIR: Should the map be able to show us what the next \$18 million worth of projects would have been in terms of priority order?

Mr Snook: Yes. I could give you a calculation that shows what length of road you could do.

The CHAIR: We could then tie that into the mapping that shows the priority areas.

[Supplementary Information No B8.]

The CHAIR: There is \$7.4 million, in round terms, to police, \$2.5 million for DoT and \$103 000 for DOTAG for speed enforcement administration costs. Are you able to tell us how that was calculated?

[4.00 pm]

Mr Cameron: That was a decision of government, but our understanding is that was worked between Treasury and the agencies.

The CHAIR: You do not know what the science is that underpins that figure? Or is there a purpose for it? What administration costs is it?

Mr Cameron: Yes, that is the processing and administration of red-light camera fines. Those agencies incur those costs from the point where the infringement is issued right through to the processing of it. That is clearly a cost of doing the road safety business. That was a decision of government for those funds to be allocated to those agencies.

The CHAIR: My final question is, in terms of the payments into the trust fund, how does it work in terms of payments into the trust fund and payments out? When do you receive the money into the fund in terms of the red-light speed cameras? Is it done on a quarterly basis as the fines are collected or is it done on an annual basis?

Mr Cameron: I am pretty sure that is monthly; we have got a monthly cash flow coming in. The fine is paid and that is then through the Department of Transport. The Department of Transport provides the funds across to us on a monthly basis, and we bank that into the trust account which is held as part of the Main Roads accounts. It is monthly is my understanding.

The CHAIR: With payments out, do you pay in advance or on completion?

Mr Cameron: That will depend on the project. For example, we are managing the trust to try and maximise the opportunity to get efficient use out of all of the trust funds. We generally pay in arrears upon an invoice. However, there are some projects where, for example, it may be a smaller agency or a non-government agency. If they have a large fixed staffing cost, and that is a fairly predictable expenditure, in some cases we do pay that in advance. Some of the police projects we will pay in advance as well, particularly if the agency is looking to enter into a contracting arrangement or something like that. They need to identify that they have got the funds; we would need to provide that in advance.

The CHAIR: Of the \$76.5 million that has been allocated for this year, are you able to give us a breakdown of which ones have actually been paid, and which are still to be paid for this year at this point in time? Can you give us a reconciliation on that?

Mr Cameron: Yes, we can do that, certainly.

The CHAIR: I will make that B9—whether you paid it or a percentage of it has been paid.

[Supplementary Information No B9.]

The CHAIR: Are there other questions from members?

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Yes. Of the \$6 million budget, how much of that is allocated to community awareness projects; namely, advertising, promotion of road safety messages? What amount is it?

Mr Cameron: Yes, there is a number. From what we have got, a number of projects will touch upon what you are referring to—education, engagement. We have improving vehicle safety, for example; there is a budget there of \$570 000. That includes a contribution to national crash testing,

but it has also got a component that is education, promoting safer vehicles. We have got road safety community education, which is the Office of Road Safety; that is about \$2 million. We also have the RoadWise program, which is doing community education; it is \$1.44 million. We have the Road Aware program in schools; it is \$1.25 million. We have a number of projects there at different levels.

The CHAIR: I was going to say, I have got of a copy of that document because I think you tabled it in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr Cameron: The minister made that available. I do not think we are allowed to table it. No, you are not allowed to table, apparently.

The CHAIR: No, there you cannot. You can here. If you have got a copy of it, we would probably appreciate it being tabled here. Actually, I managed to get a copy of it.

Mr Waldock: I have scratched on mine.

The CHAIR: We prefer the scratched version with all your scratching on it! It will be far more interesting.

Mr Waldock: We need a clean one.

The CHAIR: Yes, if you can give it to Sam.

Mr Cameron: Yes, I did learn that the minister is not allowed to table in the lower house.

The CHAIR: I do not know why that is; the Legislative Assembly is so strange.

Mr Cameron: She made a copy available, which was then copied and given to the members.

The CHAIR: Then I tracked down a copy that way, but I soon realised that members here did not have a copy of it.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: How do you measure the effectiveness of those programs?

Mr Cameron: Yes, we do a before and after assessment. We are looking for community awareness and we have some indicators there where we track the community reach, prompted–unprompted, understanding and awareness of the campaign.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Are you able to provide those figures as supplementary information, save for the measurements that you have done for the programs?

Mr Cameron: For 2012–13, definitely.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Such as for the last three years?

Mr Cameron: We can provide that. In an annual report that is actually reported; but for example, the awareness levels for campaigns in 2012–13 for our drink-driving one, and there were two of those. One was called You Deserve It; that was 89 per cent. For drink-driving behaviour, which is encouraging people to do the right thing, ok is not ok, that was 93 per cent; speed behaviour, Enjoy the Ride, 72 per cent awareness; speed enforcement, the post-it notes campaign, that was 77 per cent; safer vehicles, stay in control, that was a campaign we ran about encouraging people to purchase vehicles with electronic stability control, that was 77 per cent; and our restraints campaign, which was called “Sashes” in that year was 87 per cent. But we do report our campaign effectiveness in the annual report, yes. I am happy to provide further advice.

The CHAIR: On that point, I assume that a number of the other projects, such as improved speed compliance, the increase in breath and drug testing, that was recommended by the Road Safety Council, would you have the expected outcomes had the full program been funded? I am assuming there was some science about why you would want increases in drug testing, in drink-driving community education campaigns, in speed compliance. The enhanced traffic intelligence model—all of those projects, including speeding and community education, obviously you had a reason for

recommending those, and I assume that would have been a prediction of what would be the road safety outcomes as a result of that?

Mr Cameron: I wish we could. No, we do not have that. As I said earlier, we want to reduce, for example, impaired driving crashes. We know that an enforcement response is an effective part of that response. What we will have from police is about a proposal for X dollars and they will deliver X outputs for us. Nowhere in the world will we get an outcome from such a specific program like that; so we are monitoring overall. Those indicators we have got are at a state level. For example, if we continue to fund extra enforcement in impaired driving and impaired driving crashes are not coming down, we will ask and keep asking questions. But unfortunately, the science does not enable us to get such an outcome. I wish we could get exactly what you are saying. If we could get an outcome measure or a change and prove it was a particular project or level of a project, we would like to do that but you cannot do that anywhere. We know that enforcement will be part of the response. If we are funding enforcement and impaired driving crashes are not going down, we will ask and ask and ask. You have asked for an outcome measure, no, we could not get that.

The CHAIR: How would you base those figures? Just because the police said, “If you give us that money, we can do this amount for it.”

Mr Cameron: Yes, we are looking to get a better result.

The CHAIR: There is a general understanding that more of that leads to better outcomes?

Mr Cameron: We are going on the evidence; we are not going to fund anything or support anything that does not show us what is being proposed is an evidence-based response. But we will not get a dose-response effect. One day, we might. We have got a comprehensive set of indicators, so we are monitoring crash trends. We have got some indicators of effort being put in and we will watch and monitor those. But at the moment, we are working off the science that for impaired driving crashes one of your best responses is effective enforcement.

The CHAIR: Any other questions, members? If not, the committee will forward any additional questions it has to you in writing in the next couple of days, together with the transcript of evidence, which includes the questions you have taken on notice. Responses to these questions will be requested within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Should be you be unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date. The advice is to include specific reasons as to why the due date cannot be met.

If members have any unanswered questions, I ask them to submit these to the committee clerk at the close of the hearing.

Again, on behalf of the committee, thank you very much for your attendance this afternoon, and to your two colleagues who attended this morning’s session as well. Thank you.

Mr Cameron: Thank you.

Mr Waldock: Thank you.

Mr Snook: Thank you.

The CHAIR: I assume this document is okay to be made public, is it not? There was nothing wrong?

Mr Waldock: I think it has been, already.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: I move that it be received, made public, published and put on the internet.

The CHAIR: All those in favour?

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Yes.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much. Till next time.

Hearing concluded at 4.09 pm