

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE  
STANDING COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY INTO THE METHODS EMPLOYED BY WA POLICE  
TO EVALUATE PERFORMANCE**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
MONDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2015**

**SESSION ONE**

**Members**

**Ms M.M. Quirk (Chair)  
Mr M.P. Murray  
Dr A.D. Buti**

---

**Hearing commenced at 10.39 am****Mr IAIN CAMERON****Executive Director, Office of Road Safety, examined:**

**The CHAIR:** On behalf of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, I would like to thank you for your interest and for your appearance before us today. The purpose of this hearing is to assist the committee in gathering evidence for its inquiry into the methods employed by WA Police to evaluate performance, specifically the performance measures related to traffic law enforcement and road safety. I will begin by introducing myself and the other members of the committee. I am the Chair, Margaret Quirk, member for Girrawheen. The Deputy Chair, to my right, is Dr Tony Buti, member for Armadale. Joining us shortly is Mick Murray, the member for Collie–Preston. The committee is a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. This hearing is a formal procedure of the Parliament, and therefore commands the same respect given to the 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 over there will be making a transcript of the proceedings for the public record. If you refer to any document during your evidence, it would assist Hansard if you could provide the full title for the record.

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

**Mr Cameron:** I have.

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

**Mr Cameron:** I do.

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

**Mr Cameron:** I did and I did.

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

**Mr Cameron:** No.

**The CHAIR:** We have some questions to ask you, but before we do that do you wish to make an opening statement at the hearing?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, I would, perhaps just to set some context for the committee following the terms of reference. I do have a couple of handouts, but maybe I will just talk to it. Essentially, in this state we have got a Towards Zero strategy, which has been in place since 2008. The fundamental difference from that and previous is that we are chasing improved behaviours, but we are also chasing improved roads, vehicles and the management of speed. So, it is important that we then collect information to monitor our progress. The most obvious information we collect is based on serious crashes—that is, the fatalities and people admitted to hospital. But we have adopted a World Bank approach; we are monitoring by results. The Road Safety Council in 2012 adopted a safety performance framework, and that safety performance framework has three levels. We are focused on outcomes, which is killed and seriously injured in crashes. We are focused on intermediate outcomes, and this is where the committee may have further interest; for example, in enforcement we are monitoring speed-related crashes. We are monitoring drink-driving-related crashes, seatbelt

results et cetera. So we have got outcomes, intermediate outcomes and below that we have outputs, and there are some key outputs. In relation to this hearing, for example, it is very important to us that we collect information on police activity levels in relation to random breath testing, as an example, and also the monitoring of speeds on the network.

From an enforcement point of view, the key split focus that we ask police to have is twofold. One, we need general deterrence. General deterrence is a reminder to all of the public that the police are there and that for most people is enough to deter them from unsafe behaviour. So, that is high-visibility policing, but it is, for example, the number of random breath tests. It is the number of vehicles where their speeds are monitored. They are very important indicators for general deterrence. On a specific deterrence basis we also need police to catch people. That is where they are actually catching the people who are engaged in the extremely risky behaviours.

It is very important the committee understands that our approach, particularly with enforcement from a road safety point of view—we accept police have many responsibilities—is we really need the general deterrence and we need the specific deterrence and a combination of those. It is not an exact science how much you have of each, but the framework I have just described to you—and I do have some notes for the committee on that. It is documented through the Road Safety Council. That is, as I say, leading best practice with the World Bank. It is not an exact science. We clearly know the outcomes we are trying to improve for the community. The indicators that we have got we have set —

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, I just realised the media is still here. Maybe they can go in terms of the cameras.

**Mr Cameron:** You want me to pause?

**The CHAIR:** No, keep on going.

**Mr Cameron:** I would stress that the outcomes are quite obvious: killed and seriously injured in crashes, killed and seriously injured in alcohol-related crashes, speed-related crashes. The indicators around activity and output: based on the best knowledge we have, we have set those indicators we will monitor. We are monitoring those. So, for example, this is how it can work: if road trauma is going up and speed-related crashes are going up and the activity levels are going the wrong way, then we have questions and discussions to have. We are trying to manage by results. So, that is the way we are using those indicators. If they seem to be going in the right direction compared to the outcomes and the results, we obviously just monitor them, but once they start to go one way or the other and crashes are going the wrong way, that is when we have a line of inquiry that we start to open up. It does also tell us that, for example, if crashes are going down and one of the indicators we expect to be going down is not going down, maybe we have not got the right indicator. But, as I say, we have had this in place since the end of 2012, so I have some examples of the last set of quarterly reporting. If you wanted to have a look at that, we could have a discussion about that.

**The CHAIR:** All right. We have a fair few questions, but just on that issue, it seems to me that enforcement should be both quantitative and qualitative. If, for example, you operate a random breath test in suburbia on a Tuesday afternoon, that is recorded as a certain number of people being tested but the likelihood of either catching people or it being a deterrent is fairly low. So, what information do police give you which enables you to look at the qualitative nature of their enforcement efforts?

**Mr Cameron:** We are mainly focused on the quantitative. Until we can get a better measure, random breath tests or plastic straws in mouths, we are very focused on those. There is some evidence around from Victoria. I mean, we monitor with the other states. We do look at comparison purposes. We obviously do engage with police in the qualitative discussions. Quality of policing stops are very important, but the indicators we are using in this framework are largely quantitative.

---

**The CHAIR:** You have talked about both general and specific deterrents. From time to time we get claims in Parliament that more people are hearing the message about drink-driving, for example, and that is based on the percentage of people that are picked up as being positive under random breath tests. So, again that relies solely on the numerical information.

**Mr Cameron:** It does. It also —

**The CHAIR:** Because the percentage is going down —

**Mr Cameron:** The percentages going down can indicate an improvement but then it can also indicate a change in activity.

**The CHAIR:** That is, doing the test on a Tuesday afternoon.

**Mr Cameron:** Being more targeted —

**The CHAIR:** Or less targeted.

**Mr Cameron:** — or less targeted. More or less targeted. That is why we are tracking a number of key indicators to see what is happening over time.

**The CHAIR:** All right. Now compared with other states, there were certainly a few articles in *The West Australian* over the Christmas period that suggested that per capita we were undertaking fewer random breath testing opportunities here than in other jurisdictions. Is that the case?

**Mr Cameron:** That is the case. One of the reports I have here for you shows that in the quarterly reporting. The absolute comparisons are one thing, but for about three years we have had an increasing trend.

**The CHAIR:** But we are still behind the other jurisdictions.

**Mr Cameron:** If you compare with Victoria, and I think the measure is per licence holder, Victoria would still test at a greater intensity.

**The CHAIR:** Do you know offhand what those rates are?

**Mr Cameron:** No, but I can get that for you.

**The CHAIR:** The other indicator that I used to find particularly useful was a driver attitude survey that the Department of Main Roads used to do. For example, that would have figures saying drivers believe that it was unlikely they would be caught drink-driving on a Tuesday night or whatever, or people thought it would be more likely that they would be caught on a Saturday night or whatever. I understand those surveys are no longer being done.

**Mr Cameron:** That is correct. Main Roads, which is our parent agency, were the contractor for that, but it was administered by the Office of Road Safety. The previous transport minister did not approve that contract.

**The CHAIR:** That is Mr Buswell, is it?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, the previous transport minister. That contract, when it was required to be renewed, was not approved but we are in discussions now; we are in the process of getting a new contract organised and we will be reinstating that as soon as we get approvals.

**The CHAIR:** Was that information useful for policymakers?

[10.50 am]

**Mr Cameron:** It monitored the attitudes and behaviours; it also measured the behavioural intention of people—yes, it was. It guides our campaigns. There is a lot of interest in the amount of campaigns that go out there. We in the office use that but it is also important for us monitoring quarterly performance to know what the public is thinking. It is not the strongest measure. The strongest measures are things like alcohol-related crashes and things but it is another input to how we are going. If alcohol-related crashes are going the wrong way, we want to look at

enforcement. We used to ask, for example, “Did you drink prior?” We would like to know whether people were drinking more or less prior to getting in the car, whether or not they were caught.

**The CHAIR:** Was that also of some use for evaluating whether advertising campaigns had worked, for example?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. We would evaluate the campaigns before and after using that. We are still doing that, so we have not lost that. We still get before and after information. Where the public’s attitudes and behavioural intentions were at a time when we are planning our next campaign, we would not only look at the performance of the recent campaign, but also where the public were at more generally so we would tailor our campaign and each campaign builds on an earlier one and we keep looking at what the behaviours and attitudes are.

**The CHAIR:** I will let my colleague ask a few questions and I will come back and ask some more questions on the policing side of things.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** I will leave the policing stuff for a minute.

What about just general attitudes? Drunk-driving and excessive speed are two of the main causes of road accidents. What about just general attitudes of Western Australian drivers? Has any work been done on whether we are courteous drivers and whether we have good manners on the road?

**Mr Cameron:** I do not remember the exact question mix, but we did not just have the focus of speeding, drink-driving and seatbelts; we had a range of other measures. Some of it was directly campaign related, as I just said, but some of it was not; it was broader.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** What were the results compared with other jurisdictions and other states?

**Mr Cameron:** They are not directly comparable. One way of comparing us with the other jurisdictions is a survey that the commonwealth used to do. It is called the Wave Survey. I think they may still be doing it. I can give the committee the reference for that. That is the only one where you would get directly comparable information state to state. The number of questions in that would be quite limited so it did ask around speed, drink-driving, seatbelts, perhaps how often had you had your speed checked and things like that. The Western Australian survey that you are referring to would not give you directly comparable results because the surveys would be different.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Of course your agency would be concerned about the quality of roads that our motorists drive on. What about the actual cars? Does your agency have any views with respect to the cars that 18-year-olds, 19-year-olds, 20-year-olds et cetera should be driving?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, absolutely. We have indicators in there. We are monitoring. We are using the ANCAP five-star rating system. We also use the used car safety ratings. We have advice on our website for young people. Basically, you want them in the safest car possible.

**The CHAIR:** That is done on safety rather than horsepower or whatever?

**Mr Cameron:** Absolutely. A star rating is applied for the majority of new cars—ANCAP tests. I probably should declare for the committee that I am a board member of ANCAP. That is a non-profit situation. I am a board member or director of ANCAP.

**The CHAIR:** So you are one of the ANCAP stars, so to speak!

**Mr Cameron:** Thank you; I will leave that on the record! The ANCAP board basically goes out and buys cars anonymously and the company then crash-test those and provides independent consumer results. We use those measurements. To answer your question, yes, we want young people in the safest car possible. Because of their risks, if they are going to be involved in a crash, the likelihood of surviving without serious injury, they are much better off in a safer car.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** What about horsepower? In the area that I grew up in, speed was a thing that was demanded or was something that was highly sought after by a lot of young people and caused a lot of fatalities. Does your office have a view on that? What about legislation—mandating?

---

**Mr Cameron:** We have looked at that several times. I understand now, the question. Horsepower or the power of the vehicle is not a significant contributing factor that we are able to tease out. A number of states have legislation in place. The last time we asked, that was not based on robust evidence and science. Certainly in a couple of cases, quite public campaigns were run. The governments of the day took decisions to change the legislation. We have looked at it several times over the years and that is not a significant factor. For all of that, it was less than point-zero-something of a per cent that would make any difference. From a safety point of view, it is important that we identify the strategies that are going to have the most impact for the cost to either government or the community and that was not one that stacks up. We will keep looking at it but to date it has not stacked up with making a significant difference.

**The CHAIR:** As local members, I think we all get lots of complaints about hooning. I know hooning disturbs people's quiet enjoyment in the suburbs. It involves speed, quite often with vehicles leaving the road. Why is that an area that police seem not to be able to be successful in cracking down on? There still seems to be universal complaints about the levels of hooning.

**Mr Cameron:** I could not give you an answer to that. As you say, the underlying behaviours there are speeding. I do not know whether alcohol is involved in some of those. From a safety point of view, we are focused on those, not so much the terminology of hooning as such; we look at the underlying behaviours.

**The CHAIR:** Police have not, for example, applied for any road trauma trust fund money in relation to doing a specific project in relation to hooning that you are aware of?

**Mr Cameron:** Not to my recollection but because we have the strategy and we have identified the result areas that we need—speeding, drink-driving, seatbelts, helmet wearing are the key areas—from a safety point of view. We work with police to enhance effort in those areas.

**The CHAIR:** I understand that the Road Safety Council has looked at issues relating to repeat drink-driving and there is some interlock legislation before the Parliament. What other tranches, if you like, were there to that strategy? We were not putting all our eggs in one basket, I hope.

**Mr Cameron:** No. That strategy has had a series of things. In some of the previous legislation, those extreme offences were made illegal, so I think exceeding the speed limit by 45 kilometres an hour—some of the automatic impoundment of vehicles and things like that. While they have come up in related areas, they were part of that because we did not want people taking easy options once the interlock program came through. There were a number of other components there that have been put in place over the last few years. This is now a final stage, if you like, or another stage to get an interlock system up and running.

**The CHAIR:** Are there any other parts of that strategy that are yet to be implemented?

**Mr Cameron:** Not to my knowledge. Related to that was testing of bloods in serious crashes so there are plans to progress that.

**The CHAIR:** That is a problem, as I understand it, at the moment because if people are involved in a critical accident, their blood alcohol content is not necessarily something that police have access to. Is that the issue?

**Mr Cameron:** I do not understand the details of it but in a medical situation, the ability for police to get bloods, we saw opportunities to improve that.

**The CHAIR:** As I understand it, many of the trauma doctors do not consider taking blood for somebody who is critically injured in an accident, other than for clinical purposes. They do not want to do that. Is that the situation?

**Mr Cameron:** That has certainly been some of the commentary. In developing and working that up, we work with the health system as well as police. That will be overcome. That has been some of

---

the feedback, but other states have it. Victoria has it and others have it. As I said, there are plans to progress that.

**The CHAIR:** I just want to talk a bit about drug-driving testing. It has certainly been my view that the drug-driving testing here is very seriously underdone. Is that something that you are aware of in other jurisdictions?

**Mr Cameron:** I think we have to put that one in context. We were the fifth jurisdiction in the world to introduce drug testing. The complexities with drug testing compared with alcohol are quite significant. We do not have the exact science. We do have a round one drug of choice, being alcohol—the combinations of drugs. We have started there. The legislation had a review period, as you would be aware, in it. That was reviewed. The police made some changes. The technology is improving all the time. We will be sitting down with police again to review that area. The police have identified it. We have identified that we would like to look into this area again nationally.

[11.00 am]

**The CHAIR:** It is not truly random here, is it? That is what the issue is.

**Mr Cameron:** Most jurisdictions have been doing it in a more targeted way. Some of that has been around the heavy vehicle industry. In the eastern states—not such a big issue here—it has been around the party scene. So, it tended to be more targeted in a number of jurisdictions.

**The CHAIR:** South Australia, for example, last time I looked at it did something like 40 000 tests a year. We do nothing like that here.

**Mr Cameron:** Jurisdictions are progressing the way they do it. It started off, like us, with most of us targeting it and now we want to look at making that, as you say, more mainstream.

**The CHAIR:** So the only way you basically get drug-driving tested is if police stopped you for a random breath test, for drinking, you blow negative for that —

**Mr Cameron:** Or less than .05, yes.

**The CHAIR:** Or less than .05, but they think your behaviour is erratic or in some way might be related to some ingestion of some substance.

**Mr Cameron:** They can certainly drug test for other reasons, but generally the approach adopted here—as I say, the strategy agreed here—was that the primary concern for us was alcohol, and it remains the primary concern, so we need to make sure we reduce drink-drivers off the road. Then, as it is evolving, we are now getting increasingly concerned about drug-driving. That is what I am saying: we will sit down with police and now look at a change in tactics, but the strategy has largely been to test for alcohol and then to proceed with drugs after that.

**The CHAIR:** Do you accept there is major concern about methamphetamine in this jurisdiction? There is a high usage of it and there is also discussion of the mix between methamphetamines and road rage, for example, and very highly aggressive driving. Do you think we could be doing more in the drug testing area?

**Mr Cameron:** I understand the wider concerns. We have been getting increasing evidence, but I would repeat, from a road safety point of view, the primary drug of concern has been alcohol or poly-drug use. So, by going down the road that we have been going down, we were dealing with the primary road safety problem. That is changing. We do agree and acknowledge that we need to look at that. We are getting more evidence now and we have commissioned some reviews to look at what proportion of people do not have alcohol in their systems but have other drugs in their systems, so we will be flagging and looking at changes.

**The CHAIR:** That then brings us back to the question of qualitative or quantitative. If we are looking, for example, at mixtures of drugs and alcohol obviously, again, that would be important

---

when and where those tests were done as opposed to how many tests were done. Do you accept that?

**Mr Cameron:** That is an operational matter for police—when and how—as I say, for the general and specific deterrence. Our concern is what is happening with a number of alcohol-related crashes.

**The CHAIR:** That brings me on to what your formal discussions are with police, and I want to go into the Browne report a bit. What discussions does the Office of Road Safety have in a formal context with police—maybe sharing research information, assisting them in getting evidence as to whether or not their strategies are working? Maybe you can tell us a bit about that.

**Mr Cameron:** Sure, we have ongoing dialogue with police in the formal Road Safety Council meetings, but outside of that we have regular meetings of Road Safety, I guess, executive members between the police. But it is much more fundamental than that. A significant proportion of the data that we ultimately use is police sourced. So, that police-sourced data from crashes right through to enforcement operation activity, we use a lot of that information from a research point of view—I have already mentioned how we use it for monitoring—but you have opened up for me the other fundamental thing. In all of our research areas, we cannot do much research at all without access to police data, so we have a lot of work with police in that. More formally, the police crash data also goes across to Main Roads and that forms the Main Roads IRIS crash database system. I think you are interviewing Des Snook, so Des will probably talk to you more about that. But, essentially, we use that crash database in the Office of Road Safety. I have two data analysts. We basically log into the Main Roads crash database. In Western Australia we also have one additional step: ultimately, we are able to match the police and Main Roads crash database with the health system, so, particularly in the area of serious injuries, we are able to match that back to the source records.

In short, all of our core data comes from police and Main Roads into the crash database system. That is used not only for monitoring and diagnostics, for example, but for the motorcycle safety review that the minister has announced that we are doing work with. We have got police and Main Roads at the table, because when you are looking at 7 500 crashes, that is police information. Regarding information about the crash in terms of the vehicles and that, police fatal and serious crash investigators have that information. With the privacy protocols dealt with, we are able to access de-identified information to help us understand what the crashes are. It is not only the monitoring, but also if we are putting a new submission up to government for consideration, we would use police, Main Roads and Health information. Our researchers at the Curtin–Monash centre, Professor Max Cameron and others, would often then require access to police information and data, so we have a large draw on police for that information.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** I would like to go back to the random drug testing. You mentioned that one of the areas is general deterrence, and surely random drug testing is a much better deterrent than targeted drug testing. You mentioned that there are some complications. I am not so sure what those complications are because we have drug testing in the workplace and most sporting organisations have random drug testing. Anecdotally we are finding that, especially with younger people, drugs seem to be an even greater problem than alcohol, so I am not sure why you would not maybe be more forceful in trying to roll out random drug testing.

**Mr Cameron:** All I have acknowledged is the place and time where we are at. The primary drug of concern still remains, in a road safety setting—I accept the broader community concerns and the harms that the Chair referred to. Like most jurisdictions, our primary focus early on has been to maintain the concern around alcohol-related crashes; they are still by far and away the biggest proportion, and when you include poly-drug use in that as well—what we want to do from a road safety point of view is remove that threat or that harm. So, if we are picking them up in an alcohol-related setting, if they had other drugs there as well, we have dealt with it from a road safety point of view. What I am saying to you now is: yes, we are seeing increasing evidence that there is not just alcohol in combination with other drugs; there are those other drugs separately. I am not saying

---



that we are ignoring it; I am just giving you where we have got to so far. We have inquiries. In the national committee I am chairing we raised it last week in Hobart, and a number of other jurisdictions are in this space with us as well. It is true to say that all the jurisdictions started in a fairly targeted way. The drug-testing equipment and the systems they are using are evolving all the time. The market for drug testing worldwide is growing rapidly, so like we did with random breath testing or alcohol testing, we are going to see an increase in greater technology. It will make the job easier for police as and when we look at a wider strategy. But police certainly can test more widely and they do, as you said, between RBTs. We are looking to see whether or not we can increase that and look at taking it further. I am just giving you where we have got to at the moment; I am not saying that our intent is not to do more.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** So the intent is to do more?

**Mr Cameron:** The intent is we will be looking at the whole issue of drug-driving in more detail to see where we go to get a better result, but it will be from a road safety point of view.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Is there a budgetary consideration?

**Mr Cameron:** Not at this stage, because that is preliminary work. For a lot of these initiatives that we would do we need to investigate all sorts of things all the time and this is one of those areas that we will be working on. Then, as and when we identify some recommendations, that is when there will be budgetary consideration given.

**The CHAIR:** New South Wales and Victoria have lower road tolls than us; what are we not doing that they are doing?

**Mr Cameron:** I think certainly the recent example of the level of automated speed enforcement has been one point of difference. Western Australia was in the early 90s, I think, one of the earliest jurisdictions to adopt that technology. New South Wales have had a couple of different periods, but if you look at Victoria, essentially, they took their start and just kept going. I think most people around Australia would recognise that if you drive on a Victorian road, you expect to get your speeds monitored very quickly. Our tactics are the same; Victoria just went ahead much harder and earlier than most other jurisdictions.

**The CHAIR:** They already have point-to-point in, as I understand it.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, they have point-to-point on the Hume. My understanding is that the Hume Highway, between Melbourne and Sydney, was the first to do that. New South Wales point-to-point is only for heavy vehicles; it is not for all vehicles. Victoria went point-to-point.

[11.10 am]

**The CHAIR:** What is the rationale for having a five-year trial or strategy of this? Why are we not introducing it immediately?

**Mr Cameron:** I am not sure—we are not trialling —

**The CHAIR:** The point to point.

**Mr Cameron:** Point to point: just the complexity of the technology. We have to maintain public confidence, and police and the related agencies want to make sure that we can test the concept and ensure that we get it right.

**The CHAIR:** Have those issues not been sorted out in other jurisdictions?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, to some extent, but you still have to learn yourself, along the way. When we are talking about implementing the technology, technology is changing all the time, so that will take us some time. The trial will be up within five years; it will not take us five years to get that underway.

---

**The CHAIR:** Just about the Browne review, there was a reference to a philosophical difference. What sorts of issues come up in this area? What are the areas of contention between various agencies?

**Mr Cameron:** Contention, points of debate and discussion: the safe system approach, as I outlined at the start, is basically taking us from, simplistically—I guess I could say—we probably had a predominant focus on behaviour; chase the human being, make them perfect and do not let them do the wrong thing. The safe system approach has taken us and extended us to acknowledge the contribution that roads make, the contribution that safer vehicles make and speed management as well as behaviours. The differences or points of discussion that I recall the Browne review identifying were, I think they used the words, “the hard infrastructure versus the soft”. There were some discussions about the value of engineering versus the value of educating and enforcing—the so-called soft versus the hard.

**The CHAIR:** I want to talk about the road trauma trust fund and police making applications to the road trauma trust fund for various things. There is an argument about whether there is cost shifting applying. In other words, is police traffic enforcement a core business or not? Do you have any views on that in terms of them dipping into the road trauma trust fund for what is police core business?

**Mr Cameron:** All the agencies that are funded to some extent, all of those activities, arguably, you could say are core business. The trust fund is used to enhance and increase the levels of activity or to guide that activity in different directions. The council—there is quite a lot of documentation on this—since the 100 per cent commitment—probably prior to the 100 per cent commitment, certainly since the Towards Zero strategy—in our framework, we are basically setting the expectations of where we want to go. We have six business cases, and five of those are focused on getting better results in five key areas. There are five key areas. Number one is getting better intersection safety results; most of our serious crashes occur at intersections. The second one is dealing with single vehicles running off the side of the road, and that normally results in a fatality on a country road. I think 75 per cent of our regional fatalities are from a single vehicle running off the side of the road. That is our second business case, and we want to get better results there. The third business case is in reducing impaired driving—that is, drink and drug—given the predominant focus to date. The fourth one is reducing speed-related crashes and the fifth performance area that we invite submissions on is improving occupant protection in vulnerable road user safety, so helmets and those sorts of things. So, there are five key areas that the Road Safety Council for the last two or three years has been—it is not open slather, as such, but it is inviting proposals that help us to get a better result in those five key areas. The sixth area is not so much a performance-oriented result area; it is basically the one that helps us to implement, and that includes the RoadWise Program, our community education campaigns, road trauma counselling services and research, data et cetera.

**The CHAIR:** If I can just show you a document; I think it comes out of estimates. It is various road trauma trust account budgets for 2014–15, and there are a number of proposals there from WA Police. I think number 18 is “Increase Breath and Drug Testing”. Can you see that?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, I can: number 18.

**The CHAIR:** All right, so we have there a number of columns. I will start with the second column and that is Road Safety Council recommendations of almost \$12 million. Then there is a column which says, “Approved Budget”; who is the budget approved by?

**Mr Cameron:** I am just trying to think. The approved budget?

**The CHAIR:** And then there is a cabinet approval.

**Mr Cameron:** Hang on, sorry, the one on the left is 2013–14; so, no, the approved budget is the government approved budget at the end of the day.

---

**The CHAIR:** So that is 2013–14.

**Mr Cameron:** Sorry, that is what I was getting confused with too. So, 2013–14 is on the left.

**The CHAIR:** That is \$3.8 million.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, so that is the previous approved budget.

**The CHAIR:** And that is out of the road trauma trust fund?

**Mr Cameron:** Correct.

**The CHAIR:** Then the recommendation of the Road Safety Council —

**Mr Cameron:** For 2014–15, yes; that is the middle one.

**The CHAIR:** That is \$11.9 million, and they in fact got \$4.6 million. Is that correct?

**Mr Cameron:** That is correct, yes.

**The CHAIR:** So, in other words, Police put the submission up to the road trauma trust fund for almost \$12 million.

**Mr Cameron:** Correct, and the Road Safety Council recommended almost \$12 million.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, all right. Secondly, the next one is “Expansion of Drug Testing Capabilities”. Police, presumably, have \$700 000-odd this year and they have asked for another —

**Mr Cameron:** Sorry, that was the previous year. So, in 2013–14, they got \$763 000.

**The CHAIR:** And then they asked for some more —

**Mr Cameron:** I do not recall what they asked for, but it was recommended that they get \$842 000.

**The CHAIR:** And they are in fact getting \$576 000.

**Mr Cameron:** A bit less—now there is some work in progress on that.

**The CHAIR:** What does that involve, that one—do you remember?

**Mr Cameron:** “Expansion of Drug Testing Capabilities”: that would have been some of the machines and probably hours. But that one will change further because that is at the start of the year and we have been in discussion with Police about some of the pressures and what they need. I cannot pre-empt an approval process, but we are in discussions with Police about addressing that.

**The CHAIR:** Would it be true to say that drug testing is underdone because of not only technical issues but also some financial issues if they are coming back and asking for this kind of money?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, they asked for that amount to enhance their levels of activity. And, as I say, they were approved for \$576 000, but subsequently we have been in further discussions with them about further resourcing that area.

**The CHAIR:** There has also been consideration of the Advanced Traffic Management Vehicle project—I gather that is the new fancy car?

**Mr Cameron:** That was the 47 or 48 cars. There was a trial, and the motorcycle one was withdrawn; that did not continue.

**The CHAIR:** Do you know what the Strategic Traffic Enforcement Project is?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, I do—STEP.

**The CHAIR:** If you could maybe tell us what that is—number 24.

**Mr Cameron:** Number 24, “Strategic Traffic Enforcement Project”, is a project where they undertake additional traffic hours of duties across the state and they target seatbelt wearing or various behaviours.

**The CHAIR:** So that is separate to RBTs?

---

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. We are funding directly for the RBTs, the drug-driving and the speed aspects, but this is in addition to that.

**The CHAIR:** So they are getting about \$2.4 million for that this year.

**Mr Cameron:** That is what was approved. We are in discussions with Police about that.

**The CHAIR:** So they are after more?

**Mr Cameron:** No, they are not after more. They actually want to cease that project.

**The CHAIR:** That is something.

“Enhanced Speed Enforcement Administration Costs—WAPOL”.

**Mr Cameron:** That is the processing side of things.

**The CHAIR:** So they are getting almost \$7 million for processing out of the road trauma trust fund—to process speeding fines?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** Do you think that is the purpose of the fund?

**Mr Cameron:** The fund is there to fund any activities that enhance our ability to reduce serious trauma on the roads.

**The CHAIR:** Do you think that that processing could be met out of the administration costs or be taken out before revenue was disbursed to the trust fund?

**Mr Cameron:** That is a decision for government, but the act does enable and the trust fund is able. This is enhancing speed enforcement, so you need to, along with that activity—police increasingly, with all of their activities, are getting, I guess, more sophisticated and adept at the whole-of-strategy costs. For example, in years gone by, the trust would have just paid for some extra hours, but Police would often tell us: “Yes, but what about the backroom of the extra briefs, the extra court appearances and all those sorts of things.” With the increased activity, Police and a number of other agencies are now saying, “There is a cost at the backend of that as well. When you increase all this activity, we need to consider other costs.” That is an example of that.

[11.20 am]

**The CHAIR:** So every time there are more speed cameras put in, there are more administration costs and that is not being met by the government.

**Mr Cameron:** It is being met by the government —

**The CHAIR:** But out of the road trauma trust fund.

**Mr Cameron:** — through the trust account. Because you have enhanced the level of speed enforcement, the full cost of enhancing speed enforcement is not just the camera at the front end; it is the back end as well.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, and I see in that regard as well as the over \$7 million for police, there is another \$2.5 million for the Department of Transport.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, correct. So that is when people are paying those fines. It is the administration of that. Again, any changes and enhancement to the activity levels has a cost on those other agencies.

**The CHAIR:** So, from these various projects that I have a copy of, there is no actual research being done by WAPOL, it is all about enforcement. Is that correct?

**Mr Cameron:** At face value, it is correct.

**The CHAIR:** On the road or processing speed fines?

---

**Mr Cameron:** No, WAPOL do fund their own research in a number of areas, but we have also got—where is it? Number 36 lists ORS. We are the administrator, but that includes the Curtin–Monash university research centre, which is about \$700 000. That is not an ORS—we administer it, we manage it, but Police, for example, have submitted a number of projects as part of the annual research program.

**The CHAIR:** All right, so they then go off to —

**Mr Cameron:** So it is a Road Safety Council research program, it is not an ORS research program.

**The CHAIR:** In terms of the assessment about effectiveness of road enforcement: obviously, the critical injuries and fatalities are particularly problematical in say, the wheatbelt.

**Mr Cameron:** As a rate? Yes. Not an absolute number, as a rate; per population, yes.

**The CHAIR:** Is that due to lack of enforcement or is it due to the fact that it takes longer to get people seen to in hospitals? What is the reason for that?

**Mr Cameron:** That is a very good question. I cannot say it is just down to enforcement or the time to care, because most or some of the wheatbelt is certainly within range of good emergency cover. That is one of the reasons we are looking into that area in the highway safety review during the year. We do know that there are variations in speeding, drink-driving, seatbelt wearing. But that said, the wheatbelt does not stand out as being particularly problematic. There are a lot of single-vehicle crashes there on that road network. But again, the high-volume highways are the biggest risk, so I do not have a definitive answer for you on that one.

**The CHAIR:** Just a couple of other things, we are having someone in from WALGA in the course of these hearings. RoadWise funding has been abolished.

**Mr Cameron:** No, it has not been abolished.

**The CHAIR:** It has not been abolished; is it being cut?

**Mr Cameron:** It was adjusted. RoadWise used to administer the community grants program. That continues, but the Office of Road Safety now administer that community grant, so the amount of money for the community grants moved from a WALGA grant across to ORS. So we administer that. There was some reduction in their level of program funding, but that was, I think, two years ago. But they are still operating a statewide service and delivering that very effectively.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Who determines where the Multanovas and the other various moveable speed cameras are placed on a daily basis?

**Mr Cameron:** WA Police.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Right. Do you have any interchange with them on that aspect?

**Mr Cameron:** You asked me on a daily basis, no.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Does your research as to dangerous areas play into where they —

**Mr Cameron:** No, that is all operational matters for Police. We certainly work with them, as I say, on the need for general and specific deterrence, but the actual placements, daily operations—we would talk more at a research best practice level with them. That actual knowledge about particular roads or anything like that, they have that. They use a number of things. They use speed classifier data from local governments and Main Roads. They also respond to community complaints. They also look at where speed-related crashes are occurring.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Okay, I will leave that question.

**Mr Cameron:** I will give you a sub-answer to that: where intersections are concerned, where we are installing the speed and red-light cameras, the process works slightly differently. Main Roads will identify the intersections at risk, then Main Roads look at the engineering treatments they are

---

doing and then, if it is determined that a speed–red light camera would make a difference, it is put to WA Police. So that one works quite differently.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Can you match up data on various regions of the metropolitan area and also the country areas, as far as how many accidents occur in a specific area and the age breakdown? So are there some areas where there are more younger drivers or passengers that die or have serious injuries?

**Mr Cameron:** The answer to the first one is yes, and I think theoretically to the second one it is yes as well. We typically would break down the strategies based on metropolitan, regional and remote. There is a combination of data, but we typically get from police the data by police district. But then it is reported in the crash database by Main Roads region. So, we certainly get it at a regional level. In our regional summaries, I think we do have age breakdowns as well, so it is at a regional level. Yes, we do. I am looking at the goldfields region. The first table is “killed and seriously injured by age group and gender”.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Are you able to then interpret that data to say that certain regional factors lead to more young people dying in this area than, for instance, the outlying suburbs of Perth? You may not be able to tell me now, but maybe take this on notice: would there maybe be more younger people that are going out on speed trips or drag racing in the outer-suburb areas?

**Mr Cameron:** I could not give you an answer to that; we could look into that. I can tell you, at a population level, crashes involving young people have dropped about 36 per cent since the start of 2008. That is a combination of things. That is education, that is enforcement, that is school education —

**The CHAIR:** Safer vehicles.

**Mr Cameron:** Safer vehicles, as the Chair refers to. But also the police activities around speeding, drink-driving and those stops they do, obviously, young people are part of that. The other thing is some of the changes to the graduated licensing system as well, which are having an impact.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** That is good. What about remote areas? You mentioned remote areas. Presuming Indigenous populations more so in the remote areas, what work is your agency doing in respect to trying to reduce fatalities in the Indigenous population? I imagine it must be quite difficult for the distance required and so forth to try and impact on the —

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. We have got, as I say, it is a statewide approach. We are targeting where the crashes occur. Whether they are Indigenous or not, whether they are young or old, our fundamental approach now is to target where the crashes occur. In the areas you are referring to, for example, the pattern of crashes in the north-west part of the state is predominantly along the major highways, and then in and around the regional centres, the town sites and things like that. Regardless of background or gender, we would then be targeting those crashes. That is either an engineering response, if there are road improvements that we can be doing. We are still trying to encourage safer vehicle strategies; in those remote areas, it is very important. More specifically, we have over the years targeted overcrowding, and non-use of restraints is a particular risk factor, and then certainly crashes involving pedestrians in some of those regions as well, of which some of those pedestrians would be Aboriginal people. So we do target that, but I would stress we are looking at the location of where the crashes are occurring. Regardless of who is involved, we are trying to then reduce those numbers.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** No, I was not trying to imply that they are Indigenous, but what I am saying, though, is that there are some factors that appear to be linked to Indigenous fatalities—young drivers, no restraints, overcrowding et cetera.

**Mr Cameron:** Overcrowding are the traditional ones. Yes, absolutely.

---

**The CHAIR:** I just want to talk a bit about KPIs and performance indicators. Police recently changed theirs in relation to road traffic enforcement. Did they consult the Office of Road Safety as to what they thought was appropriate? Were there any discussions?

**Mr Cameron:** No, because it did not affect what we are getting here. Each of the agencies have signed up to what we are doing here. We have discussions with any agency if there are any issues with the data that we are collecting.

[11.30 am]

**The CHAIR:** So they did not ask, for example, what would you find useful for the purposes of —

**Mr Cameron:** There may have been conversations but, as I say, we are getting what we need from WA Police through this. That was not altered in any way, so we probably did not have an extensive discussion because we are getting what we need through this process.

**The CHAIR:** Recommendation 42 of the Browne report referred to consideration to be given to following the Victorian road safety model, in which CEO commitment to road safety is secured by requiring relevant CEOs to collaborate, to prepare and present to the Minister for Road Safety six-monthly reports on progress towards reducing road fatalities. In the Western Australian context, it is recommended that the relevant CEOs are the Commissioner of Police, the director general of Transport, the director general of Planning and the executive director of the Office of Road Safety—alternatively, the Commissioner of Road Safety. Do you have any views on whether or not you think that is appropriate here?

**Mr Cameron:** That works really well in Victoria. In Western Australia, I think 1996 was when this act was put in place originally, in the days of the Road Safety Council—Office of Road Safety, which was created administratively. If you think back to then—I do not know what your recollections are—certainly in interagency work it was typically an era of collaborate, cooperate and play nicely together. Twenty years on, we are really now, as I outlined to you earlier —

**The CHAIR:** Are you saying that is not happening now; are you?

**Mr Cameron:** No, I am saying that is happening, but we need more. We do not have to just be nice to each other. We are doing that; it is happening all the time. There was some, I think, talk at the time that agencies were not collaborating and coordinating their efforts 20 years ago; we do that now as a matter of course. What I said to you earlier is that what we are now trying to do in road safety is manage by results. We have to work together to get better results, but we need to move on in the accountability—management of results area.

**The CHAIR:** The police commissioner does not have any KPIs personally on his own performance relating to road safety. Is that something that is satisfactory, or do you think it could be improved?

**Mr Cameron:** In terms of the accountabilities, all the key agencies and their chief executives need to have key accountabilities. That is what happens in Victoria.

**The CHAIR:** There seems to be some emphasis in the Browne report as to communication with the Minister for Road Safety being somewhat less than optimal, I suppose is the way to put it. Can you explain to me how you operate with the Minister for Road Safety?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, I report directly to the Minister for Road Safety. So, administratively there are links in terms of human resources policies and procedures. Because we are hosted, as we have always been, by another agency, there are administrative responsibilities in the host agency; but for road safety, core business, policy, strategy, data and statistics, my position reports directly to the minister.

**The CHAIR:** In terms of policy, for example the government deciding to have fixed cameras and not mobile speed cameras, is that something that would be directed to the Road Safety Council or would it be directed to police; how would that work?

---

**Mr Cameron:** I do not understand.

**The CHAIR:** It is a policy decision whether you go, for example, for more fixed cameras or you go for mobile speed cameras.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, so government makes the decision on the number of cameras, yes.

**The CHAIR:** But in making that decision, government would have advice from yourselves?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. So Office of Road Safety, but typically with those sorts of things, that would be worked up through the Road Safety Council. There might be a piece of research or whatever done. We are the executive arm of the Road Safety Council, so the Chair might forward that information, but we have handled the administration of that. The minister will get that communication directly from the council Chair in some cases; the office can also provide policy advice to the minister.

**The CHAIR:** Just on that question, because it has been a bit contentious in recent days, I gather Max Cameron has come out today in the media and said that he believes that mobile rather than more fixed speed cameras are more effective from an enforcement perspective.

**Mr Cameron:** I have not seen that.

**The CHAIR:** What does the research that you are aware of say in that regard?

**Mr Cameron:** Can you just tell me what he has come and said?

**The CHAIR:** He has basically said that he believes that expanding the opportunities for more mobile speed cameras may be more effective from an enforcement perspective than adding to the number of fixed speed cameras because people are aware of where they are.

**Mr Cameron:** The number of mobiles has increased in that announcement, so that is part of the mix. It is not all or nothing; what the minister announced is a significant change but it includes fixed, speed and red-light cameras at intersections, more mobile hours—particularly with an emphasis on regional because Max is right on what he said about those sorts of areas—and then a point-to-point trial. It is all in the mix.

**The CHAIR:** Who will evaluate the point-to-point trial?

**Mr Cameron:** The Office of Road Safety will have a role. Depending on the agencies at the time, it may be a combination of two agencies. We will sit down with those agencies and work out the parameters for a trial and the key indicators we want to, sort of, get a baseline on, and then report on the difference afterwards.

**The CHAIR:** My colleague has asked about the committee deciding where speed cameras go. Who makes the decision about where random breath tests are set up?

**Mr Cameron:** WA Police.

**The CHAIR:** WA Police as well?

**Mr Cameron:** It is operational, yes.

**The CHAIR:** Is there any evaluation or audit of that from time to time from anyone in the Office of Road Safety?

**Mr Cameron:** Not from ORS. As I said, we are chasing killed and seriously injured. The subset of that on that line of inquiry is what is happening with alcohol-related killed and serious injury crashes, and then we have our indicators around RBTs and that. As I said earlier, if the indicators are going the right way and alcohol-related crashes are not, we would have discussion about the indicator; or if there is something happening that is affecting alcohol-related crashes, we would sit down with WA Police and it would be a qualitative discussion we would have. But our quantitative indicators would be guiding us; we would be asking what was going on there. Police effort may still be going up and it may be that the crashes are going up, so then we would sit down and have that conversation.

---



**The CHAIR:** Do you think there is anything in police training that could be improved in terms of traffic enforcement?

**Mr Cameron:** I am not familiar with the details. I could not comment on police training in detail.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Cyclists seem to be becoming quite a popular and important topic. In regard to your office, have you done work or are you doing research in trying to ensure that with the increasing number of cyclists on the roads that we ensure we have a safe system to interact with motorists?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, we do; we monitor all user groups and we have been doing that from day dot. Cyclists, pedestrians, older users and younger users: we monitor those. We have more recently produced some cycle campaigns specifically. But remember our strategies in the past of getting greater speed compliance and things like that, the biggest beneficiaries of those sorts of strategies are normally our vulnerable road users, which includes the cyclists. So we have the general approaches there, which will have a big impact, and we are doing further research to understand the nature of those crashes. The challenge is that the numbers are relatively small, so although there has been a lot of appropriate publicity on the increase, when you talk six, seven or eight deaths, it gets very difficult to look at trends and patterns. But we do look at the seriously injured as well, so, yes, we are monitoring that quite closely. But the system approach you referred to is the right one, and we need to target some more specific awareness-raising campaigns as well. Probably one of the two biggest things you can do for vulnerable road users is where the speeds are high, you separate; so your Perth cycle network and things become really important. The government has made extra commitments in that space. If you look at the leading countries, that is what they have done. Where you cannot separate and high speed is involved, you need to create the path network to enable that. Where there is a heavy mixture on that, you look at the speeds or speed enforcement.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** It does seem that the serious cyclists do not want to use the separated pathways.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, and that is one of the complexities—a cyclist is not a cyclist. So there are at least five or six different groups, from recreational right through.

**The CHAIR:** Advertising; what evaluation is done of advertising? Is it by you or is it done within the government media office? How is the evaluation of advertising done?

**Mr Cameron:** We have touched upon that earlier, but we would basically do some research before and after each campaign, normally through an agency or something like that. We do not do that through the GMO.

**The CHAIR:** If, for example, you have an “anytime, anywhere” ad and then you get a community attitude survey, which you do not get anymore —

**Mr Cameron:** But we will, hopefully, in the near future reinstate that.

**The CHAIR:** We have had a gap of 18 months or two years —

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, there has been a gap.

**The CHAIR:** — thanks to Mr Buswell. How do you then evaluate a situation where you have this ad saying “anytime, anywhere”, but you say that 80 per cent of the people surveyed thought it was unlikely they would be pinged on a Tuesday night? Do you then not say there is dissonance between the two messages?

[11.30 am]

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, if we had that information and, as I say, we have had some of that in the past, we would track that, but essentially —

**The CHAIR:** What do you do now that you have not got that information?

---

**Mr Cameron:** Our core business at the moment really is around the reach of the campaign: How many people saw it? What sort of main message did they take out? The diagnostics that we have got are necessarily just very focused at the moment.

**The CHAIR:** I have got to say that I have thought—I think, from time to time, the ad campaigns have been excellent—last year, it seemed to be very kind of diffuse, and I am not quite sure what is being targeted. Is there less being spent on that sort of advertising or is it just being spread across a number of issues?

**Mr Cameron:** Both; so, there has been a reduction in budget and, to some extent, we are trying to cover more issues as well. But that is something we have always managed to do in the past. But, no, there has been a reduction in the budget.

**The CHAIR:** Where is that figure in the road trauma trust fund figures?

**Mr Cameron:** There are a couple of different components. If you go to item 29, you will see “Restraints Community Education” but those ones there—sorry, it changed the one year —

**The CHAIR:** I have got a zero next to that one.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes, I know. Sorry, I am catching up. It changed in this year, so it all went into business case 6, and it went into community education.

**The CHAIR:** Which is 13.

**Mr Cameron:** No, in business case 6, it is —

**The CHAIR:** Is it 43?

**Mr Cameron:** Forty-three, yes: \$2 million.

**The CHAIR:** That is the approved budget for the last —

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. On the far right-hand side, \$2 million. “Road Safety Community Education”, a couple of previous years—the budget items move—but essentially we packaged up community education and put them into one.

**The CHAIR:** Yes. So, you are having to do more with less money?

**Mr Cameron:** There are more—well, as many campaigns, and then we have tried to, yes, keep as much coverage as we can but the budget is quite different.

**The CHAIR:** This is a philosophical thing, but there is a bit of an argument about whether the shock-horror works, or whether the humour works. What is the current kind of strategy in that area?

**Mr Cameron:** Look, you never rule it out, but increasingly you cannot just be one-dimensional with that. So, our ability to shock and horror people in a public television prime-time ad is nothing compared to what some young people can watch in a video game and all the rest of it. So, if our audience is young people, us trying to —

**The CHAIR:** They are desensitised, yes.

**Mr Cameron:** — us trying to shock them through a pre-8.30 TV ad, we are never going to be able to do that. So, you do not rule out the use of those where you think you can get an appropriate impact, but increasingly, most jurisdictions are not using just pure shock-horror. The other thing that also changes with the budget is, in the days when I started, I think we had—I might date myself here—three of four TV stations. Now, with the digital world and all the rest of it, we have got many more avenues. So, television advertising remains important but we have got a greater complexity with online and our digital use as well, moving into the social media space and those sorts of things as well. That does not have the same price tag, but it does require us to be quite multidimensional.

---

**The CHAIR:** In terms of traffic law enforcement, is there any area where police have come to you and said, “We have got problems enforcing these laws”? I think of things like tailgating; now with the latest cameras, that can be quite easily picked up.

**Mr Cameron.** Yes. The one that probably comes to mind would be—we were not the only ones, we had to change the Australian road rules—the use of mobile phones in vehicles. There were a couple of court cases in South Australia, and I think South Australian police started the ball rolling, but certainly, we were in discussions with our police, both the first time we put the legislation or the —

**The CHAIR:** Regulations through.

**Mr Cameron:** — regulations in place. And then subsequently at a national level because of police experience in some of those court cases, we did amend that a few years ago as well. So, there are examples where police have particular difficulty with something, and if something is not working, we will amend or recommend —

**The CHAIR:** Is there anything else other than mobile phones?

**Mr Cameron:** Look, there are discussions; I cannot think of any others offhand, but there are discussions that occur from time to time.

**The CHAIR:** This committee is looking at the effectiveness of police enforcement. If they are going to say that the laws in a particular area are adequate for us to enforce, that other than mobile phones, you do not think the police have got any excuses in that regard?

**Mr Cameron:** There are ongoing discussions. I cannot think of anything at the moment. As and when things are required to be changed, police sit down and talk with us and then we discuss it with the government.

**The CHAIR:** So there is nothing like that on the agenda at the moment?

**Mr Cameron:** I cannot think of anything offhand, no.

**The CHAIR:** Okay.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** I have just two different questions: one on off-road motorbikes—I know it is off-road, but they do go on roads.

**Mr Cameron:** Under the act, I am going to be limited in what I can say to you, because I mean our focus is on roads.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Yes, but that is the problem though: they go on roads.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Are you in discussion with the police force in regard to how to manage this issue of off-road motorbikes being on roads, often unlicensed, often 13-year-olds or under, without helmets?

**Mr Cameron:** Not to my knowledge at the moment. There have been various inter-agency working groups and that. Where there is a significant on-road issue that we can help with, we would get involved, but not to my knowledge.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** Your office has not been alerted to a problem in this area?

**Mr Cameron:** Not recently, in terms of on-road things or any high priority that we can do something significant about. If police had concerns about legislation or education campaigns, or something like that, we would be in discussion, but not to my knowledge. But it does not mean there have not been discussions; it just has not come to my attention.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** The other thing is defensive driving courses. When I was going through high school a long, long time ago, we engaged in defensive driving courses. Then they were stopped.

**Mr Cameron:** A long time ago.

---

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** I am not sure whether they have been re-established. If not, do you think maybe they should?

**Mr Cameron:** It is a good question; it comes up a lot. Essentially the reason a lot of them were stopped in most jurisdictions was we could not identify a benefit we were getting out of them. So, certainly people who undertake defensive driving courses and that perhaps have a predisposition to wanting to drive safer, to improve themselves. When you apply those en masse and do not give a person an opportunity to select into it, you do not get a good result. Essentially, we have not; we will keep an open mind on it, but essentially most jurisdictions have stopped them largely because we are not seeing a benefit.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Just back to the motorcycle issue, we all know that the amount of deaths has gone up nearly double —

**Mr Cameron:** Forty-four last year, yes; a record high.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I see here in the budget for 2013–14, “Motorcycle Crashes into Roadside & Median Crash Barriers”, \$50 000, but then further on in the budget there is nothing. What are your views?

**Mr Cameron:** That was the study, I think, that was being done. It may be that the study was completed; but that work ended up being completed, so it was not a budgetary issue. I am just trying to find it; what number is it?

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** It is under 30.

**Mr Cameron:** It is 30, motorcycle into median barriers—yes, that is the 2013–14 figure you are looking at?

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Yes.

**Mr Cameron:** The Road Safety Council did not recommend anything because the study would have been completed. It was a time-limited strategy; it was a one or two-year piece of research. It has been completed.

**The CHAIR:** What was the finding?

**Mr Cameron:** Largely for the road authorities to look at how and when they use and place barriers. There were some concerns at the time based on a simple email that went viral; that, for example, the use of flexible barriers is not good for motorcyclists. That is true, but the use of any barrier for motorcyclists is not good. What engineers then do is look at the opportunity cost. If that barrier was not there, which in itself is a hazard for the motorcyclist, if that barrier was not there, what is the likely outcome? And if the likely outcome on the freeway is that I hit a truck coming the other way or another vehicle, that would be a more severe consequence. The recommendations, and I have not got that detail, were around barriers are important for motorcyclists as for other users, but you perhaps can take some additional attention to where you place them. For example, on the outside of a curve where we do know that if a motorcyclist takes the curve at too much speed, they will need to lean the bike over further and they will creep wider in the curve. If you allow some distance from the edge of the road before the barrier comes in, that could potentially help a motorcyclist in those situations.

**The CHAIR:** I notice Professor Lampard is looking at his watch, so we will have to wind it up. But there was just one question I wanted to ask. The police receive a fair chunk of the road trauma trust fund moneys each year.

**Mr Cameron:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** What level of evaluation do they have to submit to the Road Safety Council after receiving that?

[11.50 am]

**Mr Cameron:** There are two levels. One is the outcome level, which we have talked about today. We are monitoring what is happening with speed-related crashes, alcohol-related crashes et cetera. While that is not just down to the police, for the funded projects, we expect to see improving results. At the outcome level, we monitor there, but for each project—the police ones are included—we have a set of performance indicators, and police report to us on those and we monitor how they are delivering: we gave you this amount of money —

**The CHAIR:** Is that something you can provide to the committee, because that is obviously very relevant?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** If, under increased breath and drug testing, you get information about enforcement hours, number of contacts —

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. We have a project plan and some reports.

**The CHAIR:** How detailed are they?

**Mr Cameron:** That is the sort of thing we would have. There are some parameters in there that police have had in terms of contacts, hours, extra enforcement.

**The CHAIR:** Is that something you can provide to the committee?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes; we can provide that.

**The CHAIR:** I think you are providing that. I think there is something else you are providing for us, which I cannot remember.

**Mr Cameron:** I did not have the exact titles for Hansard, but earlier we did refer to the safe system approach and the performance monitoring framework that we are using. Would you like some supporting documents on those?

**The CHAIR:** Yes. There was something else. The rates for RBTs in other jurisdictions—the Wave Surveys.

**Mr Cameron:** And that was per licence holder. Yes, we can provide that as well.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you very much.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I am just trying to do a quick calculation of how much the budget was reduced by. Between the agencies, do you feel that you are under pressure to back off a little bit for funding because other agencies believe they are a bit stronger? That is just looking at some of those reductions that are in there.

**Mr Cameron:** I am not sure I understand the question.

**The CHAIR:** That is funding for particular agencies. These are bids for the road trauma trust account.

**Mr Cameron:** This is just the road trauma trust account. We are not subject to pressures in other agencies.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** That is the question I am asking. You are not feeling under pressure from other agencies to just back off a little so that money balances overall, not necessarily from the trust account alone, but the way the budget is? If you are able to sit a little and not ask for increases, it can be used in other areas.

**Mr Cameron:** No, it cannot. It stays in the trust account.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** It stays in there?

**Mr Cameron:** Yes. Under the act, it does not go anywhere.

---

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** At the end of the year, if all of it is not utilised, it is a figure that helps the budget—not your budget; the state budget.

**Mr Cameron:** But it is still reallocated to road safety.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** But if it has not been utilised is what I am saying.

**The CHAIR:** The short answer is yes.

**Mr Cameron:** No; we are under no pressure there.

**The CHAIR:** How much is currently in the road trauma trust fund?

**Mr Cameron:** I would need to check that. It is about \$70 million.

**The CHAIR:** I will leave that for Professor Lampard. Is there a finance subcommittee of the Road Safety Council?

**Mr Cameron:** There was. We did not operate that this year. We changed the strategy. We did a lot more work within the office. Following the Auditor General's review, there were recommendations that included being much more clear about the rationale as to why you recommend things, so we did a lot more work in that area and then took it to the Road Safety Council. It was not possible for the subcommittee to do that sort of work.

**The CHAIR:** 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 the 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. You are providing additional information, but if you elaborate on particular points in your evidence, that will need to be by way of supplementary submission for the committee's consideration when you return the transcript. Thank you very much for your time, Mr Cameron.

**Mr Cameron:** Thank you.

**Hearing concluded at 11.54 am**

---