COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE STANDING COMMITTEE

INQUIRY INTO THE METHODS EMPLOYED BY WA POLICE TO EVALUATE PERFORMANCE

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
TUESDAY, 3 MARCH 2015

Members

Ms M.M. Quirk (Chair)
Dr A.D. Buti (Deputy Chair)
Mr C.D. Hatton
Ms L. Mettam
Mr M.P. Murray

Hearing commenced at 11.06 am

Mr NICK ANTICICH
Assistant Commissioner, Traffic and Emergency Response, Western Australia Police, examined:

Mr ANTHONY KANNIS
Executive Director, Western Australia Police, examined:

Mr IAN CLARKE
Inspector, State Traffic Operations, Western Australia Police, examined:

Mr STEPHEN ARTHUR BROWN
Deputy Commissioner, Operations and Reform, Western Australia Police, examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, I would like to thank you for your interest and appearance before us today. The purpose of this hearing is to assist the committee in gathering evidence for its inquiry into methods employed by WA Police to evaluate performance, specifically the performance measures related to traffic law enforcement and road safety. I begin by introducing myself; I am the Chair, Margaret Quirk. On my right is the deputy chair, Dr Tony Buti; on my left is the member for Vasse, Libby Mettam; and to her left is the member for Balcatta, Mr Chris Hatton. Mr Mick Murray, the member for Collie–Preston, is on his way. The committee is a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. This hearing is a formal procedure of Parliament and therefore commands the same respect given to proceedings in the house itself. Even though the committee is not asking witnesses to provide evidence on oath or affirmation, it is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of the committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. This is a public hearing and Hansard will be making a transcript of the proceedings for the public record. If you refer to any documents during your evidence, it would assist Hansard if you could provide the full title for the record.

Before we proceed to the questions that we have for you today, I need to ask you a series of questions. Have each of you completed the "Details of Witness" form?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you understand the notes at the bottom of the form about giving evidence to a parliamentary committee?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Did you receive and read the information for witnesses briefing sheet provided with the "Details of Witness" form today?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you have any questions in relation to being a witness at today's hearing?

The Witnesses: No.

The CHAIR: I note that we also have Deputy Commissioner Brown here today; hopefully we will not need him, but if there are any follow-up questions, I welcome him here today. We have some questions to ask you, obviously, but before we do that, I will ask the cameras to go. Would any of you like to make an opening statement?

The Witnesses: No, thank you.

The CHAIR: I will start the ball rolling. Given that the "Road Policing Strategy 2011–2014" has expired, when can we expect a new one?

[11.10 am]

Mr Anticich: Madam Chair, I can inform you that there is a draft currently being contemplated by the board within WA Police.

The CHAIR: When is it anticipated that that will be concluded?

Mr Anticich: I think there will be some debate around it and, obviously some costings and all those associated administrative issues around it. However, we are aware that that one has now concluded and therefore it will be a matter of priority.

The CHAIR: Assistant Commissioner, do you have a performance agreement?

Mr Anticich: In the sense of my work performance?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Anticich: I guess I do.

The CHAIR: In that performance agreement, are there any criteria relating to the enforcement of road safety laws or particular objectives or goals that you have to meet?

Mr Anticich: No, they are generally around leadership capabilities; there is nothing specific to road enforcement.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I have a huge list of questions, so bear with me! What are WA Police's priorities in terms of road safety at present, bearing in mind that this is in transition?

Mr Anticich: We are fairly simplified, I guess, in terms of our new strategy. We talk about drink driving, impaired driving, dangerous driving, driving as a consequence of inattention—most probably we simply refer to it as the five Ds. We have sought and are concentrating on those driver behaviours that we say are the most highly at risk in terms of causing both critical and fatal injury.

The CHAIR: One of the chestnuts that constantly comes up on talkback radio is, "I drove from Albany to Perth and didn't see one single copper". What role do you think visibility has in your enforcement of the road traffic rules?

Mr Anticich: It is part of, we believe, our strategy, but it is not the totality of it. The research, all of the science around what we know in road policing, tells us that there are two types of deterrent—there is general deterrent, and there is specific deterrent. That contributes to a general deterrent; that is, that people see us on the road, and one would hope it has an impact on any of those dangerous behaviours they may have contemplated by virtue of them seeing us. But it is not the total answer to that problem.

The CHAIR: How many police are involved in enforcing, if you like, the traffic laws?

Mr Anticich: All of WA Police are involved in it, but I think your question most probably goes to how many are specifically or primarily ordained to deal with traffic enforcement. Within the traffic enforcement command we have a total of about 530 personnel who work across the various dimensions of traffic enforcement.

The CHAIR: So it is about 10 per cent, is it, of operational police, or a bit more than that?

Mr Anticich: I guess that is about correct.

Mr Kannis: It is about 10 per cent. We have about 5 800 police officers.

The CHAIR: We have a submission from the police union which says that there has been an increase in the police performing no traffic duties, or less than five hours, in the last 12 months, and there is also a decrease in the number of police performing more than 35 hours per week. So, there

is an increase in police performing no or less than five hours a week, and there is a decrease in the number of police performing more than 35 hours per week.

Mr Anticich: I assume that comment is in relation to general duties police officers?

The CHAIR: Yes, it is in relation to traffic duties.

Mr Anticich: Look, that may well be explained by the fact that we have now—which changed about 18 months ago—a centralised traffic command, and effectively we have those dedicated resources, those 530 personnel that I spoke to, whose primary concern is the area of traffic enforcement within the state of Western Australia.

The CHAIR: A survey of its members by the union suggested that 62 per cent felt they should be spending more time on the road. Is that something that concerns you?

Mr Anticich: It is most probably a comment again not necessarily directed towards traffic duties, I would assume.

The CHAIR: It is a bit unfair, because you have not had a chance to read this, but, yes, it relates to their traffic duties. You believe that visible presence is certainly a deterrent, but you would say it is a general deterrent rather than a specific deterrent?

Mr Anticich: Correct, and it is one aspect of a much broader strategy.

The CHAIR: The feedback of these personnel is that there is a lack of staffing resources. Have there been maybe people who were specifically quarantined for traffic duties who have now been taken off onto other duties?

Mr Anticich: As a result of the centralisation in the traffic model, certainly it is the case that some officers returned to general duties as their primary function, but we would say that that has not resulted in any less efficiency in terms of our ability to deal with the traffic command issues.

The CHAIR: In fact, one of the points they make is that dedicated traffic staff are being deployed to perform general duties which often do not entail traffic duties. So that is a correct assessment, is it?

Mr Anticich: That was the correct assessment in the former model. In our current model, it is the case that our primary function within traffic enforcement command is traffic. However, having said that, CAD-tasking those urgent kinds of jobs are often called on where they are in the best location to respond. So there is a need for us to deal with urgent matters, which we do, but our primary function is traffic enforcement.

The CHAIR: And the police areas are getting larger, so the districts are getting larger. Does that have an impact?

Mr Anticich: For traffic, not so much. Essentially, we have moved from a non-geographic model. We have three hubs now that operate within the metro area and, in essence, we are not geographically based. We service the entire metropolitan area and our officers are predominantly on the road and travelling to and from jobs.

The CHAIR: The road toll obviously went up in the last year. Because we are dealing with performance measures for police, how much can we attribute that issue to the work, or maybe the lack of work, of police? What level of weight should we give the increase in the road toll in terms of judging the police's performance in the area?

Mr Anticich: Firstly, can I say the road toll is a whole-of-government response, whole-of-community response; law enforcement is but one aspect of it. In essence, if you look at the law enforcement side of it, we deal with those dangerous behaviours that often contribute to the road toll. However, we also adopt a safe systems approach. We can deal with speeds, but there are other factors, including the road, the drivers themselves, and, of course, vehicles, that contribute, we think, to ultimately trying to curb that road toll. We certainly play a part, but I think it is difficult to

contemplate that it is as a consequence of police effort having an impact on that. If I can, Madam Chair, by way of example, it is often misconstrued that the road toll went up last year gone. It went up, but over time it is actually trending down.

The CHAIR: It is trending down on a per capita level?

Mr Anticich: Yes. What was significant in our more recent history was the year previously, where we had a 50-year low. There were about 162 deaths on our roads that particular year. Of course, this year's figures have sort of returned to what was the normal curve or trajectory, I would suggest.

[11.20 am]

The CHAIR: So what you are saying is police cannot take credit for that 50-year low either?

Mr Anticich: You are correct, Madam Chair. We cannot attribute that to anything other than the fact that 20 less people died in regional WA, and we cannot for the life of us determine what it was that actually caused that drop.

The CHAIR: Can you tell us who decides the timing and location of random breath testing stations?

Mr Anticich: Yes. It is a fairly complex evidence and intelligence driven exercise, can I suggest. Again, bear in mind that there are two essential forms of deterrent that come from our preliminary breath testing and random breath testing; one is that of general deterrence, and one is that of specific deterrence. More times than not they are complaint-based, often determined around things such as where we deal with a fatality, or where those last drinks might have been. It can also be around a complaint, that is, from people who live in particular areas, and it is also subject to a number of constraints and logistics around where we can place the buses.

The CHAIR: One of the things that certainly is in the police union's submission is that the focus is on volume rather than detection, and it has to be said that saying that only under five per cent were blowing positive may well be a result of when and where you are testing people.

Mr Anticich: Correct. Madam Chair, that is absolutely correct and in fact that is quite deliberate. Can I say —

The CHAIR: Sorry?

Mr Anticich: It is quite deliberate in terms of our non-pursuit of —where we place the buses is about covering numbers and this general deterrent that I spoke to you previously about. Sorry, I hope you are not misconstruing this. It is not our intention not to catch people drink-driving, but rather our primary focus, and what it is that those buses are set up to do, is to get the message out to the general public that there is a likelihood that they will be caught for driving if they drink.

The CHAIR: I do not mean to personalise this, but I did get tested by a very charming young Irish officer on 27 December at one o'clock in the afternoon in the CBD. So that is the Monday when some people went back to work; it is a good day after Boxing Day, two days after Christmas, at one o'clock in the afternoon, so I would have had to have had a real bender on Christmas Day if I was still blowing positive; or even alternatively for one o'clock on Boxing Day, then it was probably too soon to get me from a long lunch on the 27th, and I do not know that I would be driving out of the city at that time. I have to say, I could not for the life of me work out—other people have given us the same sort of stories—I could not for the life of me see what the utility of testing at that time and at that location was.

Mr Anticich: Madam Chair, I have been out with the buses and done preliminary breath testing during the day, and I am quite surprised at the results that we get, believe it or not. Can I say, Madam Chair, your sober habits are not, perhaps, indicative of the more general population and others that we get to deal with, because it is not uncommon to find people who are very drunk and driving at any time of the day.

The CHAIR: But is it about not wanting to have too much paperwork or something, because it seems to me anecdotally—well, not anecdotally; as a matter of fact—that we are testing less than in other jurisdictions. Do you concede that?

Mr Anticich: I do not concede that. That might be that case, but I cannot tell you that factually. What I can say is that we test over a million people a year through our preliminary breath testing regime. Now, there are only 1.6 million people who are licensed to drive in this state, so that is a fairly significant coverage I would suggest.

The CHAIR: So it is a one in two chance of—in most other jurisdictions it is higher than that. Are you able to produce some figures on that, or not?

Mr Anticich: I can, Madam Chair, but I have brought the wrong folder with me. However, I believe we are tracking about 1.1 million. We are slightly down on last year, which was around that; I think it was only a difference of a couple of hundred thousand.

The CHAIR: So, it is less than one chance each year at the moment for people to get tested?

Mr Anticich: That is correct, Madam Chair, but if I can explain, I guess, the science behind this, we base a lot of what we do around the writings of Professor Max Cameron. The intent with random breath testing is to create the belief that there is some chance—obviously, the greater the chance, the better—that you will get tested for drinking and driving if you do that; if you embark on that act. So what we do, we believe, is deliver on that outcome; that is, the fact, I guess, that you relate to that anecdote on the 27th is that it does bring to the mind the consciousness about drinking and driving and the possibility you could get stopped anywhere at any time.

The CHAIR: Well, I must admit it does not have that impression to me. I think Max Cameron, since you mentioned him, I think he said optimally it is two per year, and after that it plateaus off in terms of people's apprehension of the likelihood of being tested. So we are very much below that at the moment.

Mr Anticich: I think the way I interpret Mr Cameron's report is that he puts it on a bit of a scale and there is a curve. He talks about, I think, that two million mark you spoke to where you start to—there is no return on the investment, I guess. It does not tell us how many we should be doing, but rather indicates at what level and what sort of return you will get in terms of deterrence.

The CHAIR: Now, you talked about where you placed these random breath tests as being based on evidence. What evidence do you use?

Mr Anticich: It is done through our intelligence area, and essentially it is set after a complaint—often data around fatal crashes that we have dealt with and where those people might have been drinking; for example, if there is a particular hotel that features as an outlet where that might have occurred. Often it is a complaint as it relates to people who live in the area. We will respond to certain events—some of the bigger type of gatherings that might, we think, bring people who may drink and drive. There is a whole raft of them, I guess, but they are the main areas.

The CHAIR: There used to be a driver attitude survey, presumably that Main Roads used to conduct, which I presume police avail themselves of?

Mr Anticich: I am not aware of that.

The CHAIR: You are not aware of it. So how are you able to discern whether the public are more or less sensitive to the idea that they are likely to be tested?

Mr Anticich: I know C-MARC undertake some studies, I think Mr Palamara—I think there is an annual study that they do at a particular location where random breath testing is done down Fremantle way, and they publish the results of that. I have read parts of that. But I would assume that is most probably a bit of a litmus test as to what the public think.

The CHAIR: You are not sure whether that dictates where a particular placement at a particular time is undertaken?

Mr Anticich: No, I do not understand that question, sorry, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: Well, does that academic research —

Mr Anticich: No.

The CHAIR: That academic research does not inform where you place a particular random breath testing?

Mr Anticich: No; I beg your pardon. That informs us as to the attitude in terms of the random nature of the breath testing.

The CHAIR: In terms of random breath testing, what is the procedure in terms of drug-driving testing?

Mr Anticich: Drug–driving testing, we conduct them also at the buses. We have got some new equipment that has actually been rolled out across the state in more recent times. Essentially, people can be identified when they come in for preliminary breath testing to be drug tested. That obviously engages another process, through another piece of machinery, I guess, where they can be tested for drugs.

The CHAIR: So it is not random, in the sense that it is only after they have been, maybe, RBT-ed for alcohol and their behaviour is picked up as being odd, or whatever—uncharacteristic of a sober driver—that the drug test is conducted?

Mr Anticich: That is not the case to my knowledge either. I have actually seen people who have been identified for drug testing in the first instance.

The CHAIR: How many are conducted a year? Are you aware of that?

Mr Anticich: I believe our target is about 10 000. So we do 10 000 I think in metro, and about 9 000 I think in regional WA.

The CHAIR: Why did you set that target?

Mr Anticich: I think it is just a realistic aspirational target for us. Now, bear in mind we have only just gone to new equipment that enables us to do it. Our older, tired equipment has expired and through road trauma trust account funding we have been able to purchase new equipment.

[11.30 am]

The CHAIR: Is there a cost related to the numbers?

Mr Anticich: There is.

The CHAIR: If cost was not a factor, would you be testing more?

Mr Anticich: No, because we are fully funded through the RTTA for those tests.

The CHAIR: South Australia, the last time I looked—it was some years ago—was testing 40 000 a year.

Mr Anticich: That is correct.

The CHAIR: Especially if we are supposed to be the meth capital of the world, why are we not testing at a greater level?

Mr Anticich: I think the fact that we now have that equipment, Madam Chair, will enable us to expand and increase our capability.

The CHAIR: But you have still only got a target of 10 000?

Mr Anticich: That is correct.

The CHAIR: As a long-serving police officer, I might open this to Inspector Clarke as well. Do you think there is a level of drug-driving that is undetected that is unacceptable?

Mr Anticich: I am very cautious of expressing opinions, Madam Chair, but if you ask me to express a personal opinion, I suspect that drug-driving is a significant issue for our society.

The CHAIR: Inspector Clarke?

Insp. Clarke: Madame Chair, what the research has shown, certainly at the moment and certainly with what we have seen in Victoria, is that there appears to be a trending downwards of drink-driving and a trending upwards of drug-driving, but the levels of those things are still emerging—I suppose that would be the best way of describing it. The drug-driving regime that we have in place now is expanding considerably and there is an element of training that will be taken out across the whole of Western Australia. So we have been very proactive on that side of things as far as bringing that to a much broader spectrum. We have seen particular results in various locations. What Queensland has seen, for example, is particular types of drugs being more prominent in certain areas, for example. I will not go into those areas, but it shows where methamphetamine is probably more evident or where THC or cannabis is more evident. So there is a lot of learning to do with that. We have actually got a very good communication network going now between Australia and New Zealand as a national and international drug-testing body, I suppose, and we are all working together developing strategies, techniques and the ways in which we do our business, so there is a lot of activity happening in that area. Certainly, as Mr Anticich said, it will be something that will increase as time goes on. There is a lot involved in what we are doing. There are a lot of technical elements related to it. The technology is still developing.

The CHAIR: Just two questions here before I let it open: are you embarrassed that this is another area that we are behind South Australia? Are you embarrassed about the level of drug-driving testing?

Mr Anticich: No, Madam Chair, I am not embarrassed.

The CHAIR: It seems extremely low to me.

Mr Anticich: I am not embarrassed. I think it is a case that we are developing capability and we will, over time, expand it. I am certainly not embarrassed.

The CHAIR: Why has it taken so long to get up to speed on this area?

Mr Anticich: I think because of a number of factors, not the least of which, as Inspector Clarke has alluded to, is that the technology continues to advance and I suggest that in the next few years there will be better technology. The current technology, as good as it is, is still not 100 per cent infallible and we still have issues around it.

The CHAIR: Are there any issues about rolling out training for officers to conduct such testing?

Mr Anticich: No, it is just a matter of logistics and lining that all up.

The CHAIR: Finally—I want to let others get onto it—do you think the online reporting of motor vehicle crashes has had any impact on the capacity of police to pick up instances of maybe drunk or drug-driving that might otherwise have been picked up if police had actually attended the scene?

Mr Anticich: I might attempt to answer that and ask Mr Clarke to fill in the detail. My understanding is that where there are circumstances of aggravation with suspected alcohol, drugs or serious injury involved, police will respond and it might be a case then of scaling back should that not be the case. Mr Clarke can provide more detail.

Insp. Clarke: Madam Chair, effectively there is a knowledge database that the police assistance centre has. If somebody rings in a crash and elements of that crash indicate that there are alcohol or drugs involved, that will be an automatic police response.

The CHAIR: I have a case that I am personally aware of in my electorate where that did not occur and I think communications need to be advised if that is the policy. Certainly I had a case where a vehicle went off-road, hit another vehicle, the driver may well have been under the influence, they were told to report the matter online, and there was never any police attendance whatsoever.

Insp. Clarke: I cannot comment on that because I do not know what was said.

The CHAIR: No. So what I am saying is there seems to be an issue of communications if that is happening.

Insp. Clarke: Madam Chair, I would say that with the volume that comes through, by and large, the police assistance centre puts most of that stuff through, so I would suggest that it would be a fairly rare situation.

The CHAIR: In any event, it would be a low priority, presumably?

Insp. Clarke: No. With our knowledge database, something like that would be of high priority, particularly with the traffic operations people.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I have three questions that are a follow-up from the answers you gave the chair to her questions. The police union has stated that in regards to the drunk-driving testing some of its effectiveness is reduced because you are using predictable locations for testing. You mentioned that you want to see a general deterrence, so you are using some locations more than others and it becomes predictable and I suppose the effectiveness of that is being reduced. What do you say? That is the police union's assertion.

Mr Anticich: It is an opinion, as there are many. However, can I say that we are very proactive in targeting and specific deterrence. We are now running in conjunction with many of our bus operations—there is a number of names we call it like "octopusing" or "hubbing"—and essentially we run targeted teams who run alongside the bus. These are singular vehicles that will patrol particular areas and look for behaviours and identify drivers who we will test. In addition, as I have been party to on a number of occasions, we will often set off on a side road where often people who are aware or become aware tend to evade and we are also there waiting to get them. So we have that targeted deterrent alongside the more general deterrent, and we are finding it quite effective.

Dr A.D. BUTI: One of the answers you gave to the chair was that the officers specified to be those whose primary duty is in regards to traffic control and traffic offences have to sometimes attend to other functions. Have you actually got data on the amount of time or the percentage of time they spend on non-traffic matters?

Mr Anticich: Not time, and, unfortunately, as I have said, I brought the wrong folder with me. I can tell you over a monthly period—if I can recall the stat, I can produce this for you—there are something like 10 000 CAD jobs, so these are taskings given to traffic officers to deal with. About half of those—5 000—relate to non-traffic jobs, but it is important to note that their primary function—so they are out doing traffic work and they might be redirected to a priority 1 or priority 2 tasking—generally will be to respond until a more appropriate general duties vehicle deals with whatever the particular situation is. I certainly have that data available and I can produce that, Madam Chair.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I was interested in your answer. You said that traffic police officers' duties are not based on geographical areas, which is new to me, so in regards to the new frontline model, how has that affected the way you deal with or operate in regards to traffic matters? The police union in a couple of places in its submission said it thought that the police districts were too large for you to have an effective visibility presence in regards to traffic matters. I know that the frontline police districts are now larger. The area I am from, Armadale, has become a large area. You are saying that the way you operate the traffic branch is not based on geographical areas but the police union says it is really concerned about the districts police are trying to cover. Can you just maybe clear up

how the frontline model has impacted on your operations and how you actually operate it if there are non-geographical boundaries?

Mr Anticich: Yes, and I will ask Mr Clarke to perhaps provide some further detail. In simple terms, the current district model has four districts within the metropolitan area, as I understand it. Essentially, we have three hubs that we operate from, bearing in mind too that we have officers who travel to and from them on motorcycles as well. In essence, our people are predominantly on the road; that is, they are going from point A to point B to deal with particular matters. So, I guess that is where the visibility side of it comes up. When I say "non-geographic", it is the case that we look at the totality of metropolitan traffic and what the priority is and we put the people to where the priorities are. We are not restricted by a particular district and it is the case that we look at the overall priority of the entire metro area. Having said all that, some of the localised policing issues around hooning and so forth area dealt with by the district, so whilst our primary function is traffic, there is still capability within the frontline officers and their respective districts to deal with localised traffic problems.

[11.40 am]

Dr A.D. BUTI: So, the new frontline model has not actually significantly changed the way you have always operated?

Mr Anticich: No. Our changes came predominantly around the centralisation of the traffic command, and our ability to direct those resources. In the former model, it was a federated model that saw traffic enforcement sit in the centre, and we have the seven districts operating as a federation and operating independently to some degree. This gives us a cohesive, total control of where we put our priority.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Assistant commissioner, in talking about visibility of police units on the road, you are saying that there is a general deterrent and also maybe a specific deterrent. Is there any evidence-based information—not anecdotal evidence—that would correlate the two of those, general and specific, that may lead you to think there should be more on the road? Is there any evidence-based information for saying that more visibility would possibly be a better outcome?

Mr Anticich: Sir, one of the things I have learnt with traffic enforcement too is there is a lot of material written around it. I do prescribe to visibility, but the realities are when you look at the size of our state with 150 000 kilometres that we need to police, in order to have a true high visibility, we would need hundreds if not thousands of police on the roads, so it becomes problematic and visibility is a bit of a general deterrent, but no. I ask the question: what sort of deterrent does it become? Because I think whilst the person sees the police vehicle and perhaps the behaviours are modified, there is every possibility that once they are outside of that range, perhaps their behaviour is not as good as it should be. What we do want to do and what we want to try to create, for example with our unmarked motorcycles, is the belief that any vehicle on the road could be a police vehicle. To me, that is a much better outcome. And visibility does not necessarily mean it has to be a marked police vehicle travelling down the road; it could be an action on behalf of police by the side of the road. People driving past a motorcycle that has engaged a driver for whatever reason, I think, sends a fairly significant message as well.

Mr C.D. HATTON: So, in follow-up to that, there is no trend towards maybe increasing visibility as a more specific target?

Mr Anticich: No, I would not see it. Having said that, and this is early days now, we are currently looking at other states where they have a bit of a combination. They have marked police cars on the sides that are not visible from the front or back. So, effectively, you have got a dual capability: the ability to detect, that being a very prescriptive deterrent, but also then the high visibility perhaps by people that may see them who would be doing the right thing.

Mr C.D. HATTON: But you are aware that anecdotally the public are always saying, and have done for years, "Where are the police on the road?"

Mr Anticich: Yes.

Mr C.D. HATTON: And given that, there is some evidence that I have read to say that some police officers would like to be on the road more; is there some correlation in the thinking of maybe getting more people out to fulfil their duty how they want it?

Mr Anticich: Sir, could I be as bold as to say that I think if we mobilised every vehicle we had on the road, I do not think it would fulfil total visibility. That is the reality.

Ms L. METTAM: Of the people that are tested for drink-driving, I understand that anything below 1.6—that is detected as being over the blood alcohol limit—is considered to be a failure or not meeting the KPI. And I understand for speeding it is a rate of anything below 15 per cent in terms of a measure between volume and detection. Should anything below 15 per cent or below 1.6 per cent for drink-driving not be considered as a success, and not a failure?

Mr Kannis: Can I clarify that question on the KPIs?

Ms L. METTAM: Yes.

Mr Kannis: Previously, up until the end of 2013–14, we had two KPIs related to traffic. One was the percentage of drivers tested for drink-driving who were found to exceed the lawful alcohol limit, and our target was 1.6 per cent. And in 2013–14 we achieved 1.1 per cent. For speeding it was a percentage of vehicles monitored for speeding by speed cameras that were found to exceed the lawful speed limit, and our target there was 15 per cent and we achieved 17 per cent in 2013–14. We no longer use those KPIs going forward. In 2011, the Auditor General determined that they were not appropriate KPIs. So an audit was done and they were not appropriate relevant enforcement indicators. They were more inputs. They were actually hard to assess whether you should be higher or lower in terms of that. So clearly we took a couple of years to actually remove those, so we do not use those as targets anymore. The only target we now have from 2014–15 onwards is to have a target that says the percentage of traffic law enforcement contact made by police officers that target category-A offences. So, that is our current KPI for traffic enforcement. And category-A offences, just for your information, includes driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs; careless, dangerous, reckless driving; non–speed camera speeding offences; no authority to drive; unlicensed vehicle; use of mobile phone whilst driving; and non-wearing of seatbelts, restraints or helmets. So, we do not refer to those KPIs any longer because they were, as you indicated in your question, hard to determine whether you were winning or losing in terms of the battle.

The CHAIR: So implicit in that, that all goes to visibility, does it not? If you are talking about contacts, the number of contacts with the public, that is about visibility.

Mr Kannis: It is about the percentage of our effort that is going towards those offences that cause the greatest harm.

The CHAIR: Actually having contact with the public?

Mr Kannis: Yes, but it is based on a percentage of, not number of. It is based on the percentage of our contact. So it is saying that 95 per cent of our cases are in category-A offences. So, it shows that we are targeting the most significant offences that contribute to trauma.

Ms L. METTAM: According to the WA Police Union, only three per cent of respondents thought that education, advertising and training was the most effective measure in reducing or improving road safety. Are there any comments that you would like to make about that? I know that much has been said about the TAC model and the amount that is invested in advertising in Victoria. I must say, I was pretty surprised when I read that statistic.

Mr Anticich: I am assuming that is the response from police officers.

Ms L. METTAM: Yes.

Mr Anticich: Yes. It is most probably expressed as a true police officer would. I think the realities are that we need to develop more complexity around how it is that we deal with people who we catch breaking the law. I have a personal belief, and certainly there are models out there, that I think alternatives to pecuniary penalty could be considered over time. I think it is a case, certainly with some behaviours, that it is how you change them. Just as a matter of interest, I guess, in this vein, as we speak the wheatbelt—you may well be aware—features quite prominently in terms of our road toll.

Ms L. METTAM: Yes.

Mr Anticich: We have a project underway now, and there are other agencies in this space, where we have identified about 79 recidivist offenders. These are people who have high-risk behaviours, and we are at this moment drafting letters that we will write to them personally, which we will hand-deliver personally, just bringing to their attention that we consider them high risk and likely to harm themselves or others on the road. So, in part, it is exploring some of these other avenues that we think may help modify behaviours. There is some science around that—some studies from Finland that have been written up by the Office of Road Safety. So we are trying to explore other avenues in terms of changing people's behaviours.

[11.50 am]

The CHAIR: You mentioned pecuniary penalties. Can you just expand on that a bit more?

Mr Anticich: Currently our system is based on a punishment by virtue of a fine.

The CHAIR: What is your personal opinion on that?

Mr Anticich: My personal opinion is that has got to be part of the solution, but I am saying that we have to look at potentially other options and certainly look at what other people are doing in other parts of the world, and exploring options such as I have spoken to, where we will personalise the contact and try to modify the behaviour before we have to deal with a fatality.

The CHAIR: My colleague mentioned the issue of advertising, and the advertising budget, as I understand, for road safety community education was cut quite substantially by $1 million. How much harder does that make WA Police's role if it cannot get the message out there as to what you do?

Mr Anticich: I guess, Madam Chair, we run our own media campaign, with no money, and tragically it is often off the back of some disaster on the road. We run a high-profile media campaign, albeit it is not funded and it is not paid for, but essentially it is trying to get messages out there to deal with. So we are not so much impacted by any budgetary constraint. Unfortunately, the fuel for our campaigns is generally someone's unfortunate mishap.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Could you just explain running your own media campaign—give an example of that?

The CHAIR: Like the White Ribbon Day and getting free media—getting the media to cooperate by putting out stories.

Mr Anticich: In addition to that, our new strategy will show the public—we will run a calendar, and effectively we run themes over individual months, lined up often with the Office of Road Safety and other government agencies, essentially trying to high-profile certain aspects. This month, we have a lot of cycling events here in Perth—it is vulnerable road users' month—and we will target particular aspects of that to try and get the profile out there about people being attentive to vulnerable road users.

Ms L. METTAM: Can you tell us a bit more about what is happening in the wheatbelt, and your response to those concerning statistics?

Mr Anticich: As recently as this weekend, and today, unfortunately, the wheatbelt continues to be quite prominent in terms of the road toll. I know that the RAC, the Office of Road Safety, the minister's office and many others have made many forays in there to try to help understand why it is that there is such a disproportionate representation of fatalities in that particular area. We have been in that space as well and we are taking a particular approach—one of them—essentially to identify high-risk recidivist drivers who we think we might be able to modify some behaviour by making direct contact with them, and taking a bit of a humanistic approach in the sense that we want to hand-deliver these letters, we want to talk to them, we want to engage them and try to see if we can prevail on their better nature. Our statistics tell us, based on last year alone, that 20 per cent of the people who were involved in fatal injury should not have been driving; that is, they had lost their licence and should not have been on the road. I suspect many of these people will form a cohort of that, or they will have risky driving behaviours indicating a prior history of dangerous driving habits, and the intent will be to try to impact on that before it happens.

The CHAIR: Mick, have you got anything arising out of what we have discussed so far?

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Just following up, is any statistic kept about whether they are country addresses or city addresses with those people?

Mr Anticich: There is, sir, and contrary to popular belief—I have that data as well, which I can provide to you—while the numbers across the regional districts in terms of residents who died is down, the disproportionate number offsets that. In other words, on average between all the other regional districts, the percentage of local folk who have died is less, but the number is so high it offsets that. Does that make sense? Again, that is a dataset I can provide to you.

The CHAIR: WA Police obviously participates as one of the agencies on the Road Safety Council. I want to just explore funding out of the road trauma trust fund for police activities. Speed enforcement, drink-driving enforcement and all of that stuff are the core business of police. Would you accept that?

Mr Anticich: Correct.

The CHAIR: So the argument then goes, if it is core business, why are you dipping into the road trauma trust fund for additional moneys?

Mr Kannis: I can answer that question. Where we support the view that these administrative costs should be coming from the —

The CHAIR: That is fine enforcement, but I am talking, for example, about the STEP program. So, enhanced speed enforcement administration costs is basically you need $7.5 million or $7 million to process speeding fines?

Mr Kannis: That was a whole-of-government decision to fund those costs from the fund. That is based on the premise that the fund should actually receive the net proceeds from speed enforcement, so it is suggesting that the fund should meet the cost of the enforcement process that raises those funds. My understanding of the original intention of the road trauma trust fund was that the net revenue would go into the fund. These are only costs directly associated with raising those funds.

The CHAIR: But things like increasing breath and drug testing, which we have heard about earlier, expansion of drug testing capabilities, the advanced traffic management vehicle project and the strategic traffic enforcement project are all matters that are core business for police, are they not?

Mr Kannis: Yes, but they were initiatives by the Road Safety Council to increase the effort in these areas on top of our normal business. This is the Road Safety Council agreeing that, over and above our normal business, this sort of money should be spent on this enforcement.

The CHAIR: All right, so STEP—the strategic traffic enforcement project—was to enable more random breath testing and more speed enforcement, is that correct, maybe at particular times of the year?

Mr Kannis: It was, yes.

The CHAIR: My understanding is that the police officers who were engaged under STEP received overtime?

Mr Kannis: That is correct.

The CHAIR: If you are looking at this from an economic perspective, that is probably not the most efficient way to enforce speed, because you are paying overtime?

Mr Kannis: We totally agree with that, and the commissioner has chosen to stop that program from 30 June 2014.

The CHAIR: Because he is saying he should be getting that money through consolidated revenue—the police budget generally—to do that work, without overtime?

Mr Kannis: I think his position agrees with yours, that paying overtime to these officers —

The CHAIR: I do not have a position; I am being devil's advocate.

Mr Kannis: The position taken was that paying the officers overtime was not the best way of spending the road trauma trust account moneys, and we agreed that the money could go back to the fund so that the Office of Road Safety could determine a better way of achieving its objectives, through the sorts of examples you referred to earlier, such as advertising and other things. It would be better spent on advertising than on officers being paid overtime to do more patrols.

The CHAIR: Assistant commissioner, I gather you are the representative on the Road Safety Council.

Mr Anticich: I am.

The CHAIR: We have heard some evidence that the police have been a bit resistant to canvassing with their fellow members on the Road Safety Council your operational activities, or where you deploy and so on. I just want to get your rationale behind not providing additional information, given that the role of the Road Safety Council is making the decisions on expenditure.

[12 noon]

Mr Anticich: Can I explain it. I know the particular scenario you speak to. Essentially, we are the primary source for most of the data that goes to other government agencies and so forth, and we produce a plethora of reports to various people, and over time we have been rationalising them, because they cost time and they cost money. That is a continuing issue with the Road Safety Council. We went from monthly reports to quarterly reports to trend reporting, and now we are talking about safety performance indicators, which is our final landing. The particular issue you raised was where we produced a quarterly trend report. There was a reference to seatbelt infringements and the figure had dropped; there was less than in the previous quarter. I was asked by the chair of the Road Safety Council as to the reasons why. I was not perturbed as to giving a reason why, but I raised the issue that this was core functionality by police; it was not the business of the Road Safety Council per se, certainly not to question what it is that we did in there. I was happy to present the data, but I thought it was inappropriate that the Road Safety Council was questioning me as to why statistics were down or asking me to report on performance around something that was not funded through the road trauma trust account. If that is where that has come from, I suspect it is that particular debate. Having said that, Madam Chair, we have got to a landing point as recently as, I think, last week with the Road Safety Council, and we are all in agreement now that the material they seek is that safety performance indicator data, and we will now focus on providing that data, which is most important for them and which they then publish.

The CHAIR: Are you able to say which of those safety criteria—maybe I will put this on notice—you would say as being core police business, because we have heard evidence that there is stuff that is outside your control? Which of those do you think, in terms of any performance indicators for police, are squarely within your responsibility?

Mr Anticich: Could we take that on notice, Madam Chair?

The CHAIR: Yes.

The RAC has also mentioned the issue that previously they have been able to get the total number of enforcement hours from police and they say that is no longer forthcoming. What is the reason for that?

Mr Anticich: Enforcement hours goes back in history. It relates back to, I think, the times of STEP—when it was first introduced. Essentially, it was buying additional capacity to put police on the road, I guess. However, the definition around a traffic patrol hour becomes a little bit hazy. What is it that you are buying for that particular hour? Are we talking about from the point that you turn the ignition on in a patrol car and you roll out onto the freeway? Is it the entire shift? What about when you have to go to court? What happens when you are back-end processing an impoundment and so forth? We no longer, I think, capture the data, never mind record it, because, essentially, it is most probably a difficult dataset to take any meaning from, because what is an actual traffic patrol hour and what we mean by it is subject to interpretation.

The CHAIR: This suggests that what the union is saying is correct—that because people are not exclusively on traffic anymore, it is harder. Presumably, if they were exclusively on traffic, you would say they have clocked on at nine o'clock, they have clocked off at four o'clock and that time is effectively traffic enforcement hours.

Mr Anticich: My understanding, Madam Chair, is that it was designed at a time when life was a little bit easier. For example, my understanding is if we impound a vehicle and that takes six or eight hours of paperwork and you are back at the office processing that, that was no longer funded by STEP because it fell outside the definition of traffic patrol hour. These were the sorts of problems that we were encountering.

The CHAIR: But that is not why the RAC wanted it. They wanted figures that they had previously always got. So you are saying they are not even recorded anymore?

Mr Anticich: I would have to take that on notice.

Mr Kannis: Our output structure used to be based around services, and that used to be based around a two-week survey. The relevance of that information was probably questionable and that is why we moved to a different output structure. The capacity for us to actually accurately get data on where officers spend their time is very difficult, and to do it accurately. Unless you have got an officer walking around each day with a button that says traffic or general duties or other things, you are not going to get to that point without imposing a significant administration requirement upon the officers.

The CHAIR: All right. We accept that that might be difficult. I understand that there is not adequate information taken about convictions and prosecutions, so we cannot even, if you like, at that end use that as some sort of indicator of effectiveness.

Mr Anticich: I would correct that, Madam Chair. We have fairly accurate data around briefs and infringements and so forth, so I doubt very much that we are lacking in that particular dataset. That goes all before the courts. I do not know where that has come from.

The CHAIR: I think that is something that the police union has said, from recollection. I found it interesting.

Mr Anticich: I have seen it, Madam Chair. I cannot quote it to you, but I would suggest that we have got fairly comprehensive records around briefs and infringements.

Insp. Clarke: The brief case system records all briefs that are created in WA Police and the infringement management system records every infringement that goes through the system, so both of those are pretty accurate databases.

The CHAIR: I am just trying to find the bit. I might get some of my colleagues to ask some questions while I find it.

Dr A.D. BUTI: You mentioned earlier in regards to road safety that it is an all-government approach and police is only one element of it. On the weekend, there was a fatality in Kelmscott at an intersection, which may have had nothing to do with that intersection but it is a notorious stretch of road at Denny Avenue and Albany Highway. My question relates to the decision of the government to basically bring to an end the late-night train services on Friday and Saturday nights. This is from the police point of view. What effect would that have on you being able to ensure that we have a safe road system, or do you think that is actually going to increase the amount of potential people driving under the influence? Anecdotal information is that there are a lot of passengers on those train services who would definitely not be fit to drive. I have been on those trains at that time and I can assure you that that is the case, and not just for alcohol. They need to get home. They can try and get a taxi—good luck—so they are going to have to find some other way. It could even be walking, and it may not actually be a safe way for them to walk to Gosnells or Armadale. From a police point of view, from a road safety point of view, do you think closing public transport lines on a Friday or Saturday night is detrimental to what you are trying to achieve?

Mr Anticich: Sir, I have previously spoken about not wishing to express any opinions, and I think on this one I will reserve that right. I do not think that that is something that I should comment on.

Dr A.D. BUTI: No; I am not going to let you get away that easily. We are here looking at the issue of road safety from the police point of view. If the avenues to use public transport on a Friday or Saturday night are reduced, do you think, with all your experience and all the data you have in front of you, that that potentially could create problems as far as safety on the road in the sense that people who have alcohol or drugs in their system should not be driving?

Ms L. METTAM: There are a lot of hypotheticals that you are bringing in.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I know, but I am just asking the question.

The CHAIR: That is a matter that the assistant commissioner can address.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Do you think potentially that that could create a problem?

Mr Anticich: If at the end of the day people are drinking and driving on the road, it does create a problem; and, if there are more people drinking and driving on the road, it creates a greater problem.

The CHAIR: In fact, I think the commissioner has in fact said that not being able to get people out of Northbridge in the wee small hours generates major problems for police in any event across the board.

I have found that passage; it is on page 12 of the union submission. I know you have not got it in front of you. It states —

> Enforcement data was readily available from the Office of Road Safety in their 10 year crash statistics report (1995–2004). Enforcement data included traffic infringements and convictions by year. This provided a concise overview about the number of infringements issued yearly and the number of traffic convictions secured yearly that addressed aberrant driver behaviours such as speeding, alcohol, helmets/seatbelts and dangerous driving. This information does not appear to be available from 2004, —

This is a matter for the Office of Road Safety rather than you —

> with annual crash statistics (as outlined in the Office of Road Safety's annual *Reported Road Crashes in Western Australia* report) failing to incorporate this data. Current (though unaudited) information from WA Police largely reflects the number of vehicles or drivers monitored or tested for drink-driving, speeding, seatbelts and restraints and other traffic enforcement, but does not include specific infringement and conviction data.

So what they are saying is that you may well have that, but it is not incorporated within the reported road crashes in Western Australia report?

[12.10 pm]

Mr Anticich: I cannot give you an answer to that; I do not know why, Madam Chair. It is not like we would reserve that information for any right if we have given it to them previously. The only thing —

The CHAIR: Would police be unhappy if that was one of the measures as to police's effectiveness in this area?

Mr Anticich: What—that data?

The CHAIR: Yes. So, charges laid or convictions secured?

Mr Anticich: I think it goes back to some of the issues that arose from our previous KPIs: what does it all mean? Does less prosecutions mean that driver behaviour is improving or does it mean that we are performing any less; if they are increasing, does it mean we are doing a greater job and that driver behaviours are getting worse? I think we just need to consider what it is that it actually means if you are going to capture the data.

The CHAIR: So if that is not suitable, what do you consider are appropriate performance measures?

Mr Anticich: I believe that the measures we have in place now in terms of measuring what we do and where we apply our effort is the most appropriate way to deal with this.

The CHAIR: You have talked a bit about deterrents. You have fixed speed cameras deployed at various locations, but as I understand it they do not operate 24/7, so sometimes they only operate for 15 per cent of the time or something. What is the rationale there?

Mr Anticich: In essence, or just to clarify that, there are five sites; in other words, the aluminium box that people see. Up until now there has been one camera that has been rotated between the five sites. The camera goes there, and obviously for the time it is there it operates for the period it is there. But there has been one camera that is rotated between the five locations.

The CHAIR: So what is happening now is that with more speed cameras you are actually going to get a real, as opposed to a virtual, camera in each of these locations?

Mr Anticich: There will be five cameras 24/7 in each of those locations; correct.

The CHAIR: Is there any plan to get covert cameras anywhere as well?

Mr Anticich: Covert speed cameras or covert —

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Anticich: Not to be confused, there are covert cameras currently being implemented that go to hooning activity—this is capturing people who are driving dangerously or recklessly. We will maintain the current fleet of cameras, which is our mobile fleet, our traffic and red-light, and our fixed camera sites on the freeway.

The CHAIR: Who funds the covert cameras for hooning?

Mr Anticich: I am pretty sure that that was a government initiative, and we have funding for that through our appropriations.

The CHAIR: You are aware that there are lots of community concerns about hooning.

Mr Anticich: Correct.

The CHAIR: It is said to me anecdotally that police will not enforce hooning other than on main roads; is that correct?

Mr Anticich: That is incorrect.

The CHAIR: Have you got the resources to enforce it more broadly?

Mr Anticich: We do, but I think the magnitude of the problem needs to be thought through. We impound over 10 000 vehicles a year, and a large proportion of them relate to hooning-type offences. That is a lot of vehicles. If you do the maths, it unfortunately is a behaviour that is quite significant across the community.

The CHAIR: So the number of vehicles impounded, is that an appropriate performance measure?

Mr Anticich: Again, we need to be careful because it is a double-edged sword. If the numbers go up, or down, what does it actually mean?

The CHAIR: There are also community concerns, I think, about road rage. That is something that is, I suppose, difficult to enforce unless there is an actual assault occurring. What is the feeling of officers on the road as to how much of that might be, for example, drug fuelled?

Mr Anticich: Again, it is hard to theorise and I guess I need to be careful of opinion, but there does seem to be a high degree of anxiety and very simple things that would appear to escalate to very significant or serious acts on the part of individuals. I have no science or evidence to base it, but it does seem like aberrant behaviour that is most unusual.

The CHAIR: Are there any legal or rules that need changing that might affect police's performance or efficiency in terms of enforcing road rules?

Mr Anticich: Look, I think that —

The CHAIR: Mr Kannis looks like he might have something to contribute here!

Mr Anticich: I think it is the case that it is an evolving environment and we continue to be confronted by new and different changes. We have got identity around numberplates and people who are taking conscious efforts to disguise who they are and what they are driving; mobile phones; distraction. We do not really know what the future holds, and I would suggest that we have to continue to evolve and confront and most probably come up with different strategies, part of which will have to be legislative reform.

The CHAIR: The road trauma trust fund receives its funding from speed and red-light cameras. There is also other traffic enforcement; for example, handheld radar. Where does that revenue go, and about how much is that a year? Do you know?

Mr Anticich: My understanding is that that is all infringement, and it is all incorporated into the road trauma trust account.

The CHAIR: Inspector Clarke?

Insp. Clarke: On-the-spot fines go to consolidated revenue; it is just speed camera.

The CHAIR: What is the quantum of that each year?

Insp. Clarke: I do not know.

The CHAIR: Is that something you can find out for us?

Mr Anticich: We can get that.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Do you think that that money should go into the road trauma trust fund as well, or maybe to buy some cars for traffic officers?

Mr Anticich: Madam Chair, we do not get any direct access to any of these funds, so it is just part of our duties.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Off-road motorbikes: a lot of times they actually are not off-road and they are on roads. I have great sympathy for the police on this, and out in my area it is a bit of a problem. But I am told by police officers, off the record, that they will not engage in a chase, often because they are kids aged 12 or 11 without helmets, and you can imagine if there is a fatality et cetera. But it is a problem, and I am just wondering what is the police strategy in respect of that?

Mr Anticich: Sir, I have had exactly that experience—two kids, one with a helmet, one without, driving down the road who gave me the thumbs up as they drove past, and it is really problematic as to how you deal with the issue. It may well be one, I think, for better education. There are different models throughout other states. But I really do not know where it goes. I think maybe the bigger-term objective will be some off-road areas where perhaps these kids could better take their bikes.

Dr A.D. BUTI: What about hooning-type legislation?

Mr Anticich: Problematic: one, identifying the motorcycle; two, identifying the owner; three, identifying the child; and, four, dealing with them as a child. It is a complex problem. It is not easily solved.

The CHAIR: When police put up cases to the Road Safety Council for funding, I think the Road Safety Council recommended $12 million from the trust account for increased breath and drug testing, but WAPOL only received $4.6 million. Do you receive any explanation as to why there is that disparity? Any feedback?

Mr Kannis: I am just trying to determine, with the request, whether we asked for more. Can we take that on notice?

The CHAIR: Yes. As a general principle, you put up a case, and in this case it was $11 994 416, and you got $4 621 211. That was project or proposal 18, business case 3.

Mr Anticich: It was not over the course of a number of years, was it, that first figure?

The CHAIR: No, it was 2014-15. Anyway, is it generally the case that you get feedback if you put a bid up and you do not get what you asked for?

Mr Kannis: We get feedback, and I can only imagine that they have a process of rationalising across a number of initiatives. So we expect that if we have asked for more than we actually end up receiving in the end, it is because they have got a small amount of money to spread across a number of initiatives.

The CHAIR: So that is the cabinet or something?

[12.20 pm]

Mr Kannis: It is ultimately the minister's decision and cabinet's decision, I believe, about what we get allocated. The Road Safety Council makes a recommendation, I believe.

The CHAIR: How much feedback do you get which would enable you to better craft your subsequent submissions?

Mr Kannis: My view is that the feedback is adequate for us to be able to inform future business cases. It is not generally about the quality of the business cases but more about their capacity to allocate the total amount requested.

The CHAIR: I think we have covered this but I want to make sure: what do you say, assistant commissioner, to the proposition that this greater emphasis is about volume rather than actual detection? I am looking at drink-driving, but it is probably more general.

Mr Anticich: This is drink-driving?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Anticich: I should not say there is a greater focus, but volume and general deterrence is an important part of the strategy.

The CHAIR: You talked a bit about people's complaints based about where you place drug and alcohol screening activities. What other information, if it is a site of frequent crashes or incidents —

Mr Anticich: Correct. Often, after a fatal crash involving alcohol, we will find out where was the last place they had a drink. It might be a case that we sit off that particular area or one of the main routes there. In other words, if we have had a fatal crash and that individual—it might be completely independent of where they were drinking, but we identify that place they were drinking and if there is a pattern there, we may target that specific area, that particular drinking place, whatever it might be.

The CHAIR: I hate to bring this up because I know that you were pilloried in the media: I think it was the Big Day Out at Claremont Showgrounds —

Mr Anticich: Correct. I remember it well, Madam Chair!

The CHAIR: There was a random breath test set up on Mounts Bay Road —

Mr Anticich: Correct.

The CHAIR: Quite early in the morning.

Mr Anticich: About 11 or 12 o'clock, I believe, Madam Chair, leading up —

The CHAIR: That is going to the showgrounds.

Mr Anticich: Correct.

The CHAIR: What was the rationale for doing that?

Mr Anticich: General deterrent, exactly that—telling kids on their way there that police are out in force; drink-driving is an unacceptable practice; do not do it; we are here now; we will be here when you come out.

The CHAIR: But you were not on the other side of the road when they came out.

Mr Anticich: I could not tell you, Madam Chair. I am still licking the wounds from that one! I think we also stopped most of the university students from getting to their class on that particular day as well, so I had to deal with some unhappy professors.

The CHAIR: And the good citizens of the western suburbs going about their lawful business.

Mr Anticich: Correct.

The CHAIR: That is a situation where it is a general deterrent as opposed to you having any hard evidence. It was nothing about catching people that were preloading or anything like that?

Mr Anticich: That was part of it. There was also a predilection to certain types of drugs as well. There was the possibility that people were preloaded and/or under the influence of drugs.

The CHAIR: From what you have told us there would have been a very remote possibility, unless they were very obviously off their face, that they would not have been tested for drugs.

Mr Anticich: Back then, our technology and our machinery would have been lacking so that is most probably—we would have had a capability there because we knew what those venues attract and certainly what the crowd going there would have been into.

The CHAIR: Do you have a target? If resources are available and everything else, what would be the optimal target for you as to testing per driver per year for random breath testing? It is under one a year at the moment—do you have any particular target?

Mr Anticich: No. Again, I go back to the Cameron report. My interpretation of it is what the return is in terms of what you put in. What Max Cameron also says is if we create the belief that there is some chance, then we are doing our job. Obviously the more we increase that chance, the better it is, but right now I believe what we are doing is more than sufficient.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The police KPIs: I think in 2013–14 traffic law enforcement and management was a KPI, now it has been dropped. If that is the case, how is that assisting in measuring efficiency in the area?

Mr Kannis: Just to clarify that we do have a KPI for traffic law enforcement, being the percentage of traffic law enforcement contacts made by police officers that target category A offences. We have one.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I am more referring to efficiency indicators. In 2013–14 you had a list of seven: intelligence and protective services, crime prevention et cetera. One was traffic law enforcement and management and that is not the case now. I am wondering how that is assisting in measuring efficiency in the area.

Mr Kannis: I can clarify that the reason we moved from seven to three is a bit of the factor I referred to earlier: actually tracking what officers spend was proving to be very inefficient and actually not accurate. The only way we could do it was a survey over a two-week period. Those seven services they were broken up into were actually just the result of that two-week survey. It was agreed, I think, with the Auditor General and with Treasury, and in discussions when we were at the estimates committee, to say we need to find a better way of working out our cost efficiency because it was not proving to be very accurate.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Was it a decision by the police commissioner or the minister?

Mr Kannis: It was actually a decision made by the police commissioner in consultation with the minister and approved by Treasury and the Auditor General's office.

The CHAIR: We have had evidence from local government, from WALGA, saying that although the majority of accidents occur on local roads, there is not enough police presence on local roads. Can you comment on that?

Mr Anticich: I might throw to Mr Clarke on that.

The CHAIR: I do not know—whoever.

Insp. Clarke: The way that we police it in the metropolitan area and certainly into some of the broader rural areas is based on complaints—intelligence that we have around particular areas. If we talk about where we have our three hubs, if we want to use that term, certainly in the southern hub we have a purpose-built centre being built in Forrestdale as we speak at the moment, which will be a location point for all of our southern deployment of resources. Those resources will have sectorised roles and will go to some of those local areas that we talk about. They work in conjunction with the local policing teams within the police districts. The traffic operations people will take a more broad approach. Where we have significant issues occurring—for example, you might have an area with a very high hoon concentration or activity occurring during certain times—we will go in and really target those areas. That may involve the use of cameras or it may involve the use of mobile patrols and unmarked vehicles. Say you have a single person within a certain street that is behaving badly—hooning behaviour and everything like that is really, generally, quite significant antisocial behaviour as well as a road safety issue—that becomes a local policing issue. They will target those people because it is important to know who those people are. That goes across the whole of the metropolitan area. When we talk about having those three, we have a more specialised role and perhaps more of an umbrella approach in the way that we do our targeting. We sectorise, so we are trying to put those resources in the best places that we can, where they are needed most at the time.

The CHAIR: Do you concede that you perhaps have not been as responsive as you have needed to be on local government concerns?

Insp. Clarke: I would not say that. I think we have actually probably more extended things as far as that is concerned. We have the local policing teams, which are working very much in the local community now, and the traffic operations element is bolstering that and supporting that where there are spikes in some of that sort of behaviour.

The CHAIR: You are aware that the City of Joondalup, for example, had a proposal 18 months or so ago to have their own speed cameras because they felt that there was not sufficient speed enforcement in their area. It was due to complaints by their constituents. Surely, that is consistent with local government concern that there was not enough local speed enforcement.

Insp. Clarke: Sorry, Madam Chair, I could not give comment on that because I was not aware of that.

Mr Anticich: Madam Chair, within the current mechanisms, if the City of Joondalup says that it has a problem and it expressed that through the WA Police, as with any other complaint, we would look at it and obviously determine an appropriate response.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Where does the Crime Stoppers phone system hook in with your group? Being a good politician, we handball off to Crime Stoppers and they say we get very little response, especially on road issues because they are of the moment. Are there any stats kept on calls about traffic on Crime Stoppers versus general crime, I suppose, and enforcement along those lines?

[12.30 pm]

Insp. Clarke: Sir, that is probably best described as that the 131 444 is the term used for the hoon hotline, if you like, for general traffic complaints. What happens then is that information comes through the police assistance centre and it is then sent to our intelligence area. They analyse that data and where it relates to specific people, if it is not something where we can actually prove an offence—because many times we get people ringing up complaining about something, but they do not want to go to court, which leaves us in a nowhere situation. However, what we do is build an intelligence profile on particular offenders and that in turn goes to areas like, for example, our special operations Nimrod area. Their sole role is to target recidivist serious offenders. So that element is very important in targeting those types of people. The information we get is used, but it may not be that we can necessarily action some of it.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: So placing a booze bus and those sorts of things. Is that information used for that?

Insp. Clarke: That is correct, sir.

Mr C.D. HATTON: With the local governments, is there any data on how you work alongside local governments with their security patrols and the amount of information they feed you and how you get back to them? Is there any data on that?

Insp. Clarke: Certainly a representative from our state traffic intelligence area actually works and liaises quite regularly—almost weekly or fortnightly—with WALGA. I have been along to WALGA several times myself talking to representatives from RoadWise et cetera and talking about the things that we can do and the opportunity to feed information into us so that we can actually do something with that data and actually create those profiles that I have talked about and that intelligence that we can utilise to target particular areas. They are feeding information into us. If you talk about local government patrols and they are saying that they are identifying an issue here all the time, if they let us know about that, that gives us the opportunity to feed that information to not only the local policing teams, but also through our intelligence unit to our patrols. What we have done since we did the centralisation is we have a traffic tactical sergeant 24/7 operating out of the police operations centre. That sergeant oversees and supervises all our patrols right across the

metropolitan area and provides support across regional WA. When we have emergency situations like fires, for example, they are able to ensure quick deployments to those areas via vehicle control points. They also redirect our resources where they are needed. So if we have a spike, for example, in your local government area on something occurring that is happening now—say it is in Mandurah—we might drag the resources that are up towards Rivervale and say, "Right, get down there. That is a problem down there at the moment." That is what the traffic state operations do and the local policing teams are generally dealing with something that is happening at a local level.

Mr C.D. HATTON: On top of that, how effective do you regard the local government traffic and security to your organisation in helping you to fight crime and improve hooning?

Insp. Clarke: Sir, I cannot talk about research and data specifically, but certainly my own personal experience is that the eyes on the street project, certainly worldwide, we know that the more information that is being fed in and if people see things that are occurring, the less likely crooks are likely to go to an area because they know the likelihood of getting caught is increased.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Regarding targeted testing, you have probably identified that targeted testing with speed and alcohol and seatbelts and mobile phones are key areas, yet there is some indication from what I have read that members of the police force believe that you should be targeting fatigued drivers, distracted drivers and drug-drivers. With the area of say fatigued drivers or distracted drivers—I am sure "distracted" probably means those under drug influence as well—is it hard to police fatigued drivers? It is a big thing causing road trauma, apparently.

Insp. Clarke: Sir, the fatigue side of things, a lot of that is technology based. The technology is developing quite rapidly in that area and certainly I know that in the heavy vehicle industry and the mining industry a lot of things have been put in place to manage that. From a random testing perspective, that has not reached that technology capability yet, but that is all part what we are trying to do as far as policing road safety. Talking about random drug testing, that is very much an evolving technology and something that we are increasing to do, but that has an overarching effect on the amount of testing that we can do because it takes longer to do a drug test, so it impacts on everything. Everything has a cause and effect.

Mr C.D. HATTON: There are no real penalties for fatigue, are there?

Insp. Clarke: Unfortunately, there is if you have a crash.

Mr C.D. HATTON: If you can determine it.

Insp. Clarke: There is dangerous driving causing death for a start or grievous bodily harm. Unfortunately, that is when it occurs, so education is a very big part of it. High-order skills is probably the area that we largely need to be going to with attitude and behaviour. I think the research will show that even training can be helpful, but the mindset has to be right.

The CHAIR: I presume, assistant commissioner, that you have read the Browne report?

Mr Anticich: Yes.

The CHAIR: Is there anything there that you vehemently disagree with?

Mr Anticich: No. We think it is a move in the right direction.

The CHAIR: We have had evidence from the RAC that suggests that there needs to be a greater level of accountability across the relevant authorities and that there might be a need for those in the respective agencies—at the DG or commissioner level—to have some component in their performance indicators to address road safety issues. Has that been discussed? The deputy commissioner is sitting back there; I do not mean to put you on the spot, but has it been discussed or canvassed?

Mr Anticich: I have raised it with the commissioner and brought it to his attention. I understand that it is not dissimilar to a model that operates out of Victoria. That is about the extent of the discussion.

The CHAIR: Inspector Clarke, you mentioned emergencies such as bushfires. Does traffic management and staffing of roadblocks come under your bailiwick or someone else's?

Insp. Clarke: Madam Chair, what we do is an initial response. We have developed an extremely good working relationship with Main Roads WA, and it provides outstanding services as far as support to vehicle control points. What is happening now—again, it has become a part of that tactical sergeant—they have a direct link to the traffic operation centre so when we have an emergency situation like that, we will do an initial response and we will flood that area to put the emergency situation in place to protect life and property, effectively. What will happen in the intervening time is that we will talk to the traffic operations centre and they will deploy traffic management teams to take control of those vehicle control points as things progress. There is still a requirement for policing at some level in a lot of these emergency situations depending on the nature of the way the emergency is going, but they are certainly putting things in place to release our officers to get back to their on-road duties.

The CHAIR: So you could not say, for example, that a police officer who is staffing a roadblock is necessarily traffic; they could be general duties?

Insp. Clarke: They could be, Madam Chair, yes.

The CHAIR: Are the operational guidelines formulated within your area of responsibility, assistant commissioner?

Mr Anticich: I think I have primary responsibility of our vehicle control points, but in an emergency situation—priority 1, priority 2—the nearest available vehicle or asset will be able to perform the job.

The CHAIR: Obviously in traffic enforcement you have come across a broad range of people in the community. Are there any particular issues that you think can be improved in terms of liaising with ethnic communities, for example?

Mr Anticich: One area that perhaps I do want to have a bit more of a look at is a lot of Indigenous people in the remote areas and some of the crashes we are seeing involving youth. Those who are not authorised to drive and unroadworthy vehicles are a bit of a problem and it is an area that I would like to look further into.

The CHAIR: In that context, are you able to say how the alcohol interlock trial went in, I think, Roebourne or somewhere in the Pilbara? Is that something you are familiar with, Inspector Clarke?

Insp. Clarke: No, not at this stage.

The CHAIR: If you could get us some information on that, that would be helpful.

There is a lot of literature analysing performance measures for police and what is international best practice. I want to put six criteria to you and ask you how relevant they are in terms of traffic law enforcement. The first one is "Attentiveness—A visible police presence". Would you say that was important, not important, marginally —

[12.40 pm]

Mr Anticich: Attentiveness on the part of the —

The CHAIR: A visible police presence.

Mr Anticich: A visible police presence. I think it is, yes, again an important factor, yes.

The CHAIR: The next one is "Reliability", which is explained as "A quick, predictable response".

Mr Anticich: Agree.

The CHAIR: "Responsiveness—Attempts to satisfy people's requests and explain reasons for actions and decisions".

Mr Anticich: Agree.

The CHAIR: "Competence—Know how to handle criminals", not necessarily relevant in this case, "victims, and the public".

Mr Anticich: Agree.

The CHAIR: "Manners—Treat all people with respect".

Mr Anticich: Agree.

The CHAIR: "Fairness—Equitable treatment for all—especially racial equality".

Mr Anticich: Without dispute, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: Are there any other areas or performance indicators that you think are particularly relevant to traffic law enforcement that we have not mentioned?

Mr Anticich: No.

The CHAIR: I might let you take that on notice as well.

Mr Anticich: I will contemplate that. Thank you.

Ms L. METTAM: There seems to be a lot of enthusiasm in the community and amongst WA Police to see a greater police presence, less time in the office and more out on the beat, if you like. Are there any moves or are there any tasks that WA Police are no longer undertaking behind the desk to, I guess, respond to those concerns and dedicate more resources to being out on the road where everyone else can see you?

Mr Kannis: If I can answer that question, we are near the end of our service definition and resourcing model process, which has been going for about 18 months. Part of that process is to identify cases where fully sworn officers are in positions that do not need to be behind the desk. That is due to be completed around the middle of this year. That will inform our workforce mix requirements going forward. Certainly, there are a number of officers who are sitting behind desks who do not need their sworn powers and we will have better information on that towards the end of this year.

Ms L. METTAM: Is there a capacity to provide additional police resources to areas which may double or triple in population, seasonally? I come from the Vasse electorate, so sometimes the population can more than double in that area over the summer months. Is that a decision made within the district or beyond?

Insp. Clarke: I can probably tell you that we actually have been doing that for quite some time. The state traffic intelligence coordination unit—that is one of their specific roles. So every time we have events or functions that are occurring—particularly in regional Western Australia where there is an influx of people, as you quite rightly say—we bring extra resources in and police ingress and egress as well as what is happening during the time that people are down there. Certainly, a lot of that work is already happening and has been happening for a while.

Mr Anticich: I went down for leavers just gone, the police presence down there—traffic, mounted, K9—we were there in support of the local jurisdiction. So, yes, we do. We run our almost regular campaigns around the major holidays. There are significant traffic movements and people move throughout the state and we place buses in regional locations to do quite a bit of work in that regard.

Dr A.D. BUTI: You are a bit young for leavers, are you not!

Mr Anticich: Let me tell you, sir, I felt a lot older when I got there.

The CHAIR: You stuck out in the caftan, I bet!

Since we have the deputy commissioner here and you have been very patiently back there listening, are there any comments you would like to make? You can come up to the desk and grab a microphone.

Mr Brown: I am fine, unless you have any questions you want to ask.

The CHAIR: There are a number of issues on which you will provide some information and the research staff will contact you and give you some reminders as to what they are.

Thanks for your evidence before the committee today. A transcript of this hearing will be forwarded to you for correction of minor errors. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days from the date of the letter attached to the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be added via these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary submission for the committee's consideration when you return your corrected transcript of evidence.

In that regard, I can say that we only just recently received the police union submission. That is likely to be on the committee's website, so you might want to avail yourself of the opportunity of looking at that and if there are any areas with which you take exception, you, of course, have the right to respond to that to the committee.

Hearing concluded at 12.45 pm

_____