

**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 TWO

Members

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

Hearing commenced at 11.56 am**Professor MURRAY LAMPARD****Chairman, Road Safety Council, examined:**

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, I would like to thank you for your interest and your appearance before us today. The purpose of this hearing is to assist the committee in gathering evidence for its inquiry into methods employed by the WA Police to evaluate performance, specifically the performance measures related to traffic law enforcement and road safety. I would like to begin by introducing myself and the other members of the committee present. I am the Chair, Margaret Quirk. To my right is the Deputy Chair, Dr Tony Buti, the member for Armadale, and to my left is Mr Mick Murray, the member for Collie–Preston. The committee is a committee of the Legislative Assembly. 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 for you 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 document during the 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?

Prof. Lampard: I have.

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

Prof. Lampard: I do.

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

Prof. Lampard: Yes.

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

Prof. Lampard: No.

The CHAIR: Would you like to make a statement before we commence asking you some questions?

Prof. Lampard: Perhaps a very short one, Chair. I was appointed by the current government as chair of the Road Safety Council in October 2012. I am now in my third year. My letter of appointment finishes on, I think, 31 October this year. Over this period of time, it has been my role as a part-time person to chair the Road Safety Council and make a contribution to road safety in Western Australia.

[12 noon]

The CHAIR: How often does the council meet?

Prof. Lampard: The council meets roughly about eight to nine times a year.

The CHAIR: And there have been subcommittees in the past, so that there are additional meetings that you are involved in.

Prof. Lampard: Primarily, during my tenure, it was the finance subcommittee, which did some final evaluation work in regard to the submissions to government on the road trauma trust account

funding recommendations. However, a lot has changed. I think I was two days into my appointment when the Auditor General's report came out, which was a bit of a shock to me. Since that time I have been working with the Office of Road Safety in developing and enhancing those recommendations, so that we have a much more robust, transparent process of applications for RTTA funding.

The CHAIR: I think that might have arisen out of the fact that the finance committee was presented with quite a large level of expenditure which you were supposed to sign off on over four days. You had a short deadline or time limit in one instance. Is that something you are familiar with?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, that is true, but the other issue that concerned me greatly was that, even though the term "independent chair" is not used any more, as the one independent person that I believed I was on the Road Safety Council, again we had people who were recipients of funding actually sitting on the finance subcommittee, which in my mind—I have been very outspoken on this—was a significant conflict of interest.

The CHAIR: My information was that the finance subcommittee had something like four days to decide on expenditure of over \$100 million. Is that correct?

Prof. Lampard: I am not sure, Madam Chair, on that time frame, but not a lot of time is allocated because they are made up of people from various organisations from the Road Safety Council so we did not have a dedicated body playing the role of the finance subcommittee.

The CHAIR: So now that that is done, everything is done within —

Prof. Lampard: Within the Office of Road Safety, with, we believe, some robust parameters around that.

The CHAIR: You have heard the evidence of Mr Cameron—you were sitting in on that—so —

Prof. Lampard: Some of it, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: Is there any commentary you want to make on that, or do you want to add to anything Mr Cameron has said before we start grilling you separately, or is there anything that you want to comment on there?

Prof. Lampard: I assumed that you might ask me some of those same questions, as to my view, so I am certainly prepared for those.

The CHAIR: Okay, so there is nothing, from your perspective at this stage—do you concur with what Mr Cameron said?

Prof. Lampard: Generally.

The CHAIR: Generally? Where do you take some exception?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, I do concur with what Mr Cameron said, but he is an individual and I am an individual. We both come from experienced backgrounds, and I am not going to sit here and say to you that I endorse every single thing that Mr Cameron said.

The CHAIR: I am giving you the opportunity to say where it is you depart. Is there anything that you thought was —

Prof. Lampard: You asked a question about the Victorian model, where they hold CEOs accountable for road safety initiatives. I have a strong view on that.

The CHAIR: All right, so let us hear it.

Prof. Lampard: I believe that they should be. I have worked a lot with Peter Browne. One of my concerns as chairman of the Road Safety Council is that so few do so much in the road safety space. The time is long overdue for more government agencies to put their shoulders to the wheel and show an interest in road safety. Last year 484 people had their lives changed for ever. Some died—

186 died—and the rest were critically injured. It is a disgrace that Western Australia incurs such a road toll as we do. And the way of —

The CHAIR: When under the Towards Zero strategy, a lot of that is preventable.

Prof. Lampard: Well, it is. The Towards Zero strategy is a world-class strategy. We have learnt a lot from, particularly European and Scandinavian countries that have the lowest road toll per 100 000 in the world. There is lots of very, very good things they do. It is a real team effort. All the government agencies pull together and saving people's lives on our roads is a focus for everybody. So it is a focus for all the government agencies. It is a focus for government and, most importantly, it is a focus for the community. If we can harness all of that energy, all of that goodwill, all of that intellect, it is my view that we would not be seeing the numbers that we have in fatalities on Western Australian roads.

The CHAIR: All right, it would be the CEO of transport or Main Roads, police—what other agencies do you think should take some responsibility?

Prof. Lampard: Education and health.

The CHAIR: Education and health. All right, so I think previously the police commissioner had some KPIs in his performance agreement, and I think the rationale for him removing them, or for them being removed, was that he did not have sole responsibility. Do you think that, irrespective of that, to the extent that he can control it, he should have some KPIs to that effect?

Prof. Lampard: Definitely. The police play a really important role in road safety in Western Australia, but it is true and fair to say that they do not have the only role. Their role is enforcement, and road safety is a much, much broader challenge than just enforcement. You have heard me speak, and I am quoted in the media many times as being a real fan of high-visibility road policing—targeted high-visibility road policing. We cannot have a policeman on every corner but, Madam Chair, if I had a dollar for everyone who said to me “I drove from Perth to Albany” or “I drove from Perth to Karratha and never saw a car on the road” I would be a wealthy person. We are seeing some improvements, particularly on our freeways of a morning with cyclists, but nothing, I believe has greater effect on the minds of people than when they see high-visibility road policing out there.

The CHAIR: Driver distraction is certainly a factor, and it seems to me that there is nothing better to make you undistracted than if you see a copper drive past.

Prof. Lampard: No, but the fairness of it must be that police only have finite resources to be able to provide this. If they are doing a particular action or an initiative out somewhere—a proactive initiative—and something happens in the community like a robbery or someone being assaulted, naturally they are going to divert their resources to that.

The CHAIR: With all due respect, the traffic resources are really ring-fenced in the sense that you do not have traffic people going out to a major crime investigation, so there really should not be any excuse for those resources being diverted.

Prof. Lampard: Well, I think there is a bit of a halfway point there, Madam Chair, and that is that at a major crime scene, of course, traffic management sometimes is an issue and they will bring the resources of the traffic branch in, but high-visibility road policing—the superintendent down in Bunbury had so many good initiatives. He did not have the actual physical people to put in vehicles, but he developed an initiative that engendered high-visibility policing out in his community. To me, that was thinking outside the box. He understood the need to actually have that visibility on the roads, and he was going to find some way to actually roll it out. I wish many more were as innovative as he was. As I said, there is a lot to be done. When we look at the Victorian model, why has Victoria been so successful? Why does Victoria have the lowest killed per 100 000 rate? They will tell you every time that it is about strong enforcement, which includes high visibility, and the work that they do on safer roads.

The CHAIR: While we are talking about police resources, it is probably a good segue into the fact that a significant proportion of the road trauma trust funds go into what is routine police operational work—expanding drug-testing capabilities, doing random breath tests, processing speeding fines and so on. Do you think that is optimal?

[12.10 pm]

Prof. Lampard: Optimal, no, but as a necessity, yes. We need to provide police with the tools to be able to carry out aspects of their job.

The CHAIR: Why is that not done in the budget? Do you have this discussion with anyone?

Prof. Lampard: In some parts, the minister and I have talked about it—about the issue of what is commonly referred to as double dipping, where police access road trauma trust account funds primarily for the back-end work, the administration work, and I have a view on that.

The CHAIR: Would you like to share that with us today?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, I do. I just think it is a reality. Before I was the chairman of the Road Safety Council, about \$15 million or \$16 million used to go into the RTTA fund, which would allow Office of Road Safety and other government agencies limited opportunity to address some of the big ticket items. With the change in legislation, where 100 per cent of speed and red-light camera revenue went in, it took the fund to over \$100 million and that gave the Road Safety Council and the Office of Road Safety the opportunity to make meaningful recommendations to government on how that money should be spent. So, my view was, I hear the argument, I hear the fact that people say that it is cost shifting—and the RAC have talked about that a lot—but, to my mind, the \$9 million or \$10 million that we spend on the back end is worthwhile for the return of over \$100 million to spend on road safety initiatives.

The CHAIR: Except that you do not have \$100 million to spend on road safety. I mean, there is a lot of controversy that it is not all actually being expended

Prof. Lampard: Yes, that is right. That is a decision that the government takes, not to expend that money. We certainly fulfil our side or fulfil our role in making recommendations to government on what we consider will give the best outcomes to the community for road safety.

The CHAIR: So, for example, the increase in breath and drug testing: the Road Safety Council recommended \$11.9 million, and the amount given to the project was in fact \$4.6 million. Do you get feedback when your recommendation is cut in half, for example?

Prof. Lampard: Obviously, I am not happy about it, but at the end of the day the government makes the decision to reduce it from 11 to four point —

The CHAIR: Do you find out why?

Prof. Lampard: Look, I have some discussions, but I am not briefed totally on the rationale behind the reduction.

The CHAIR: Is that not a hamper to future decision-making: “We’ve put this up to the cabinet road safety subcommittee; we think that \$11.9 million worth of increase in breath and drug testing is warranted. It’s come back with only \$4.6 million spent. I wonder why there is a difference.” How is that going to affect your future decision-making if you do not know why?

Prof. Lampard: My comment to that is that it never takes away from the fact that, we as a Road Safety Council, still think that \$11 million should be spent on that. It is a priority. As Mr Cameron said in his evidence, impaired driving is a significant issue for us. We have had some really good results in regards to young drivers—meaning the reductions in the amount detected—but we still have issues with the 35 to 50-year bracket in regards to drink-driving, where I feel that we have kind of gone backwards a little, and we are not getting a clear enough message through, and a lot of

that is about education and a lot of that is about how we communicate that strongly to the community.

The CHAIR: You have heard Mr Cameron say there has been a decrease in the advertising budget. Are you happy about that?

Prof. Lampard: Not at all, because it went from some \$11 million to \$1 million.

The CHAIR: And I presume you have had discussions or briefed the minister on that?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, I have had discussions with the minister.

The CHAIR: What sort of response did you get?

Prof. Lampard: At the end of the day it was a government decision.

The CHAIR: Did you say that that was false economy because all these other initiatives would not be readily appreciated if there was—it was harder to enforce if that message was not going through with the enforcement effort?

Prof. Lampard: With great respect, I am just trying to come to terms in my own mind as to whether the conversations that I actually have with the minister are confidential or whether I am required to tell you and your committee what the conversations are that I have with the minister.

The CHAIR: Well, if you give evidence that you have received an answer from the minister and that is why you acted in a certain way or that is why you undertook to chair the Road Safety Council in a particular way, if you have given evidence about a conversation, I would have thought you needed to disclose it. If you prefer not to give that evidence, then perhaps you should not mention that you had a discussion. Look, I will go onto something else and we will come back to that. This committee is interested —

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Chair, before you do, what does concern me—and it is not about the discussions or anything else—is about your future planning when you have been knocked back so hard. You are going from the millions of dollars out and the minister has said no, or the cabinet has said no. Your next approach could quite possibly be a lot softer than your first approach. Is that a concern also?

Prof. Lampard: Thank you. No, because we stay very focused on the ball. We know from an evidence base what is the best spend, we believe, under the auspices of the Towards Zero strategy, so we believe we are quite clear on what the best spend is on road safety. At the end of the day we put those recommendations to government. The government either approves them or they do not. That does not change the fact that we are not still committed to the advice that we have provided to government. I would suggest to you that we would continue with that advice the following year in regards to funding.

The CHAIR: Retirement or not, I would be livid if I knew there was this money sitting in the road trauma trust fund that was not being used and yet recommendations are literally being halved. How can we judge police effectiveness if they are getting half of what they asked for?

Prof. Lampard: It is a real challenge actually to do that. Over this last year—it is now nearly a year since the Browne review was released, and then some six months prior to that—many new ideas, many initiatives, many recommendations to government were certainly not done away with, but put on hold waiting for the outcomes of the Browne review. Now, the Browne review, as I said, was delivered to Parliament on 13 March last year, and we are hoping, shortly, that decisions will be made in regard to those recommendations. They are very good recommendations. They deal with a lot of these issues. They provide a much more transparent process to access RTTA funding, something that I have been concerned about for a while, and I could say to the committee that I have certainly adopted the line in the media that the minister is waiting for the outcomes of the

Browne review. There was also a review into campaigns and educational material that was done by a Sydney-based firm. That has not been released as yet.

The CHAIR: When do you anticipate that will be released, or will it be released?

Prof. Lampard: I do not know, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: Is that something that the council has seen?

Prof. Lampard: No.

The CHAIR: Thank you. One of the recommendations of Browne was to get rid of the word “independent” from your equivalent position. It is going to be a commissioner, I gather, under the Browne recommendations. Is that because you and past chairs have been taking your independence very seriously and have been fierce advocates for road safety issues?

[12.20 pm]

Prof. Lampard: I cannot speak for the other Chairs, but, yes, I took my position as independent Chair very seriously. I am passionate about what I do, or else I would not be doing it. As I have said to the minister, I am just as happy up at my beloved Lake Karrinyup Country Club playing golf, Madam Chair —

The CHAIR: It is a different sort of handicap up there!

Prof. Lampard: Yes! I am here because I want to be here.

The CHAIR: Sure.

Prof. Lampard: But from the beginning of my appointment, there was some discussion about this word “independent”. Some legal advice was sought in regard to that and subsequently the term “independent” was removed, almost within, I think —

The CHAIR: Who sought the legal advice?

Prof. Lampard: The minister’s office sought legal advice from the State Solicitor’s Office.

The CHAIR: What initiated that happening?

Prof. Lampard: I do not know for sure, but it was done in the term of Professor D’Arcy Holman when he was the Chair of the Road Safety Council.

The CHAIR: And the advice that came back was that there was no legislative basis for using that term? Was that the general gist of it?

Prof. Lampard: I cannot tell you exactly what the exact legal advice was, but in a nutshell —

The CHAIR: Have you seen the advice?

Prof. Lampard: I have, only after a request.

The CHAIR: Yes. And you still describe yourself as “independent”, so have you and the minister have come to some agreement?

Prof. Lampard: No. I do not use the term “independent” chairman or chairperson of the Road Safety Council. In my mind, I try to be independent in thought and provide good, honest, commonsense feedback.

The CHAIR: You work in a professional way, and you give your advice without fear or favour, no doubt?

Prof. Lampard: Yes. So I still declare that I believe I am the only independent person on the Road Safety Council. RAC is pretty close there, but all the rest are basically government entities.

The CHAIR: So in terms of government policy, how is that conveyed to you? Do you have regular meeting with the minister? How does it work?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, I do. I meet with the minister monthly and talk about road safety issues, listen to her about areas of concern and bring her up to date in things that I think are important for her to know.

The CHAIR: So in areas like, for example, this halving of the police expenditure on drug and drink testing—I will not trespass onto private conversations, but if you can tell me in general terms—did you get some sort of feedback as to why that occurred; that is, the government's policy is now X, not Y, therefore we want to focus expenditure on Z?

Prof. Lampard: Not from the minister, but in some instances from her staff.

The CHAIR: Okay.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I assume that you serve completely at the pleasure of the minister, in the sense that you can be terminated before the expiry of your appointment?

Prof. Lampard: I guess she could withdraw my letter of appointment. I am not quite sure of the legalities of that.

The CHAIR: Professor Holman did not serve his full term, did he?

Prof. Lampard: Yes, he did.

The CHAIR: He did, but he was not extended, or something?

Prof. Lampard: He was not extended, no.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I assume you chair the meetings of the council?

Prof. Lampard: I do, yes.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Does Mr Cameron sit in an ex-officio role at your meetings?

Prof. Lampard: Mr Cameron sits as a councillor. He is an appointed councillor under the legislation.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Are you the only person who has authority to speak to the media about matters related to the council?

Prof. Lampard: Probably, yes. By that, I mean I would be quite happy for other councillors to speak on behalf of the Road Safety Council, but they will not, because they are enshrined in their own government guidelines and so forth. So, I have an arrangement with the minister that I have free access to the media to talk about operational issues. If I am going to talk about policy or legislation or matters of government, I at least give her the courtesy of giving her advice prior to that actually happening.

Dr A.D. BUTI: In your discussions or meetings with the minister, do you relay the contents of that back to the council?

Prof. Lampard: Yes. They get a detailed brief every month on everything that I do.

The CHAIR: There used to be a communiqué that came out from Road Safety Council meetings, and that was publicly available. Does that still happen? I suppose I should have asked Mr Cameron this question.

Prof. Lampard: Mr Cameron's area provides that, and it is a synopsis of things that the Road Safety Council is doing. I do not actually write that myself.

The CHAIR: It is almost like the minutes.

Prof. Lampard: With respect, Madam Chair, it is just a very, very broad overview of things that perhaps were discussed, but not all, at the meeting. It is stuff that goes out, basically, that would be of interest to the community.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Do you have regular contacts would either the police commissioner or members of the police force?

Prof. Lampard: I have no contact with the police commissioner. Assistant Commissioner Nick Anticich is on the Road Safety Council as the police representative, so I have reasonably regular interaction with him.

The CHAIR: Does he always attend or does he send a delegate sometimes?

Prof. Lampard: He sends a delegate at times, yes.

Dr A.D. BUTI: But outside the confines of the meetings, do you have regular meetings with the police force?

Prof. Lampard: Actually, I do, because we have a media strategy that we are working on at the moment—it has been going now for 12 months—where we theme each month—it might be seatbelts; it might be speed; it might be drink-driving—where the whole goal is to bring all the agencies together. I must say it is a real challenge to come together and make a contribution to media that particular month. The goal is to have all the different agencies talking about seatbelts, talking about drink-driving, talking about whatever the theme is. We have a good one coming up in May, which is wet-weather driving.

The CHAIR: Let us hope we have some rain!

Prof. Lampard: Yes. That encompasses all of the agencies. The person who works incredibly well with me on this is Neil Stanbury, who is the director of media and public affairs at WA Police. He does a fantastic job. It was the police initiative initially, and then subsequently they have asked the Road Safety Council to take that on board, and through circumstances I am the one who actually drives that initiative now.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Due to your position, which is incredibly pivotal to the issue of road safety in Western Australia, and due to your previous position in the WA police force, I am surprised that you do not have meetings with the police commissioner at all on road safety. Is that by choice or is there some other reason why you do not have meetings?

Prof. Lampard: I just find that it is easier for me to deal with Assistant Commissioner Nick Anticich. I mean, this is his portfolio. Karl has lots of other issues, and he is not always available. I always have a direct avenue to Nick Anticich, and he can provide me with anything that I need, I believe, in relation to police enforcement.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Have you ever tried to have meetings with the police commissioner?

Prof. Lampard: No.

The CHAIR: You heard me ask Mr Cameron some questions about qualitative versus quantitative information from WA Police; for example, you tested 500 people in X period, without knowing when and where and how that testing was conducted. Do you regard that as a bit of a problem, that, just looking at the raw figures, there is a story that is not being told?

[12.30 pm]

Prof. Lampard: It is a bit of a fine line, Madam Chair, and that is that we get information that is provided to the Road Safety Council as part of their quarterly report, which you are aware of. We found probably about six months ago that the council was going through the report in detail and holding the police representative to account on seatbelts, following too close, and mobile phone infringements, which were not in the ambit of the Road Safety Council, as Nick Anticich quite rightly said, it is actually his account. The commissioner is accountable direct to the minister not to the Road Safety Council, so we actually had to pull back.

The CHAIR: That was a bone of contention, was it?

Prof. Lampard: It was a bone of contention, and a fair one, because some of the questions Nick Anticich was getting from members of the Road Safety Council, who perhaps could have been better informed, were about core policing activities, which they have a responsibility direct to the Minister for Police on.

The CHAIR: That begs the question: if it is core police activities, why was it being funded out of the road trauma trust fund? Is it not legitimate that they ask questions if in fact the Road Safety Council is assisting to get these activities funded?

Prof. Lampard: Madam Chair, if I may say, the questions they were asking were on topics not funded by the road trauma trust account.

The CHAIR: Such as?

Prof. Lampard: Patrol hours and placement of cameras and so forth; where operations were being set up.

The CHAIR: That is relevant. I have a bone of contention, for example. I got RBT-ed on Tuesday after Boxing Day at 12.30 in the afternoon in the middle of the CBD. I am a statistic of having been RBT-ed, but I can bet you anything that they would not have recorded one single positive test at that time. Therefore, they can test 300 drivers and not have the processing time but on the stats it looks as if they have done 300 RBTs. It was too late in the day for me to be hung over and still be recording a positive from the day before; it was too early if I had had a long lunch and it was three days after Christmas, and it was in the middle of the CBD. The chances, frankly, of them having any positive results there would have been Buckley's and none; yet they present to you and say—they do not even say it is such and such a time—on that day we did 300 tests. To me, without having that information it is completely meaningless.

Prof. Lampard: But the police are not accountable to us for that information.

The CHAIR: But you are funding them to have increased testing.

Prof. Lampard: Increased testing. Targeted testing —

The CHAIR: They then boast and say, “We’ve got a lower percentage of people recording a positive.” Of course they have got a lower percentage, because they are testing at times when the likelihood of finding someone with a positive outcome may well be less.

Prof. Lampard: With respect, Madam Chair, the mother they got the other day in the school zone dropping her kids off to school blew 1.85 or 1.87. The police tell us that—you would be quite surprised —

The CHAIR: It is mismanagement, Professor Lampard.

Prof. Lampard: Yes, but all I can say is that we have no control over where police actually —

The CHAIR: That was not a random breath test. I predict that that would have been irregular driving and they then tested her, which is different from conducting a random breath test.

Prof. Lampard: Yes. My point was that there are people on the roads at all hours of the day or night who can be impaired by alcohol. The choice of location, the resources they put into it, is something the police do themselves and are not accountable to the Road Safety Council for.

The CHAIR: All right. You were a deputy commissioner, very experienced and long serving and a well-respected police officer; what performance measures would you put in for police? Do you think the current performance measures are satisfactory?

Prof. Lampard: Firstly, may I say, it has been seven years since I have been a police officer, so I am a little out of date. But certainly the information that the police provide to us—meaning to the Road Safety Council and to the Office of Road Safety—is important information that allows us to certainly develop our strategies on where we think the money should be targeted.

The CHAIR: You have mentioned the operation and it is not really the Road Safety Council's business to question operational decisions of police. Are you saying it should be Assistant Commissioner Anticich or whoever is in that role, bearing in mind the minister also says she is not involved in operations either? This is the problem. How do we scrutinise that?

Prof. Lampard: The system, unfortunately —

I will start again. I am hoping, with the Browne review, there are a number of things Peter Browne has recommended that will actually address a lot of these issues.

The CHAIR: You would have been interviewed, I think, by Mr Browne?

Prof. Lampard: I was interviewed by him, but I had many, many meetings with him and I made a number of written submissions to him. I certainly was very enthusiastic about the Browne review.

The CHAIR: One of the recommendations was —

That it be recognised the management of road safety programs is inhibited by the lack of Towards Zero guidelines and milestones and the reluctance of some agencies to comply with monitoring and evaluation requirements.

Are you aware of what agencies he would be referring to?

Prof. Lampard: He did not actually articulate those agencies but certainly in general, I agree completely with him. The RAC in Western Australia does more for road safety than most of our government agencies. They are committed; they reinvest —

The CHAIR: That is an ad they could not pay for.

Prof. Lampard: Well, I am in a closed hearing, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: It is not closed; there are a few journalists behind you?

Prof. Lampard: Sure, but I stand by that remark. They work very well. They are truly committed to road safety in Western Australia and they have put a lot of money back into road safety, particularly in the area of youth education and safer vehicles. They are a pleasure to have on the Road Safety Council.

The CHAIR: How can we get a better nexus between funding and road safety outcomes; do you have any ideas on that?

Prof. Lampard: One thing, of course, is to cut away all the bureaucratic tape on the principles and practices around allocation of RTTA funding. I have believed for a long time that we are far too prescriptive in who can apply for RTTA funding. There are lots of agencies out there that could make a significant contribution to road safety in Western Australia—this is a moot point; the minister does not agree with me on this I must say—but it seems to me that unless you are a member of the Road Safety Council, you cannot access RTTA funding. At worst if you are an outside agency you have to join with —

For example I have talked a lot about the Royal Flying Doctor Service, the RAC rescue helicopter and FESA, which does all its rescue work in regional Western Australia. People like them cannot access RTTA funding unless they join up with health or police and put forward a submission.

The CHAIR: There is one here from DFES, but I note it did not get any money at all. That is for heavy rescue capability for DFES in country regions, which makes eminent sense.

Prof. Lampard: Yet we know, Madam Chair, that the sooner we can apply expert or professional medical facilities to people involved in crashes, the more chance they have of surviving. There is ample evidence of the number of people who have died in regional Western Australia from critical injuries they have received because we could not get medical attention to them quick enough; or worse, we could not get them out of the car because they were trapped inside vehicles. That is part

of the Browne review and I am hoping—I might not be around to see this—with a revamped structure, a revamped —

The CHAIR: Browne recommendation 27 —

That it be recognised there are significant philosophical differences in approaches to road safety in WA —

I think we have canvassed that —

and the Office of Road Safety's lack of authority limits its capacity to coordinate and align agencies in road safety strategies.

Is that something with which you agree?

Prof. Lampard: Absolutely. The Office of Road Safety has got its back to the wall through the bureaucratic process that it actually has to work within. Mr Cameron did not say, but he probably has about three or four masters; he has the managing director of Main Roads that he answers to.

The CHAIR: He is a very modest individual.

[12.40 pm]

Prof. Lampard: He answers to the director general of Transport and then indirectly to the Minister for Transport and, of course, his main accountability is through to the Minister for Road Safety. So, he is working in this environment of —

The CHAIR: You have heard us talk about effectively of the road trauma trust fund funding police core work like RBTs and drug testing and so on. What level of reporting goes back to the Road Safety Council, and is that something that is not robustly discussed? You talked before about Assistant Commissioner Anticich saying that something was operational. Does the evaluation also get considered by the council?

Prof. Lampard: Absolutely, Madam Chair. Every two or three months we have a meeting just dealing with statistics and reporting, which is about evaluating and monitoring the RTTA projects. Assistant Commissioner Anticich is held very much to account in regards to RTTA police funded initiatives. He reports on those and —

The CHAIR: How long would a report be on, say—let us have a look—the advanced traffic management vehicle project, for which they have got half a million? So, would that be a one-pager or a 10-pager; or how detailed would that report be?

Prof. Lampard: The Office of Road Safety actually has a person that is evaluating RTTA projects every day. But we receive a written report from the police in regards to their progress. It is atypically the red light–orange light–green light–camera assessment model that tells us whether they are on track, whether they are ahead of track or whether they are behind track. We deal very much with that. If I can just say, I mean, Main Roads are a very good example where quite often throughout the year, nine or 10 months will go by and they have got red lights on all of their projects, but they spend all the money by the end of the year or they acquit all of their subcontractors and the money is used. So, we have just got to be mindful about progress, but we are there to assess each program, get justification as to the correct spend of the money that is being put into that program.

The CHAIR: How can we tell whether something is due to lack of enforcement or people are being deterred? What is the magic formula for that? If, for example, someone says, “Oh, only four per cent of WA drivers were picked up for drink–driving”, how do we know that was due to deterrent factors as opposed to just a lack of targeted enforcement?

Prof. Lampard: Very hard. Of course, you referred to the community surveys, which will tell you a lot. One of the things they have done in Victoria is that they have actually convinced most motorists in Victoria that if they drink or speed, they are highly likely to get caught. People have

this notion that if I run the gauntlet, if I speed, if I drink and drive, the chance of me getting caught are great. Unfortunately, we do not have that here in Western Australia.

The CHAIR: I have got to say, I spend a lot of time on the Mitchell Freeway and people slow down about three kilometres from the fixed camera going north and then they speed up about half a kilometre past the fixed camera. I have got to say that the deterrence value of that seems to be limited.

Prof. Lampard: I think point-to-point cameras offer a better option there and certainly at last we are actually trialling some point-to-point cameras. I have just come back from Scotland and the UK and it is amazing; they are everywhere—point-to-point cameras. It is deemed to be a much fairer way of measuring speed enforcement. There is a better road safety message in that and, of course, research around Australia, let alone overseas, has shown the value of point-to-point cameras.

The CHAIR: You heard me asking Mr Cameron some questions about hooning. Do you regard hooning as a threat to safety or is it merely a disruption in people's quiet enjoyment of the communities?

Prof. Lampard: It is definitely a threat to safety, Madam Chair, and we have got ample evidence of where people have been seriously injured or killed through the actions of hoon driving behaviour.

The CHAIR: A lot of communities complain. If you took a straw poll of a number of members of Parliament, we all get numerous complaints that those laws are not being adequately enforced. Is that something that is being considered by the council?

Prof. Lampard: The whole issue of hooning and, a media term, "road rage" have been a real focus for the council. We have commissioned research on both those topics. We provide that information back to the minister when—the outcomes and results. I think one of the best outcomes that we have had in more recent times is the red-light and speed intersection cameras where Curtin–Monash Accident Research Centre did some really good work. They actually did two reports on that to show the value of those installations, those investments, because crashes have simply been reduced by, you know, up to 60 per cent.

The CHAIR: Just quickly, I know the RAC have been very patient. In terms of this road rage and hooning research, who is undertaking that? You said you commissioned it.

Prof. Lampard: It is being done by C-MARC, and MUARC in Victoria are kind of the umbrella that sits across all of that and are doing a lot of research that actually has implications across Australia.

The CHAIR: All right. When is that being concluded?

Prof. Lampard: I am not sure. The two research reports on speed and red-light intersection cameras have been completed and are available. There has been some work done in Victoria in regards to road rage or what they call road violence. They are trying to take that term away. We take note of all of that research.

The CHAIR: Is there anything else that you would like to say at this stage?

Prof. Lampard: I just wanted to clarify, Madam Chair, my comments about the RAC. As I said, in my mind I am independent. They provide a lot for road safety in Western Australia. I have been critical, of course, of everybody putting their shoulder to the wheel and I am just telling you the truth regardless. There is nothing in it for me.

The CHAIR: I did not think your comments were exceptional at all.

Prof. Lampard: I think the RAC in the space of road safety do a fantastic job for the people of Western Australia. Regardless of whether the two people sitting behind me are actually listening to that, the truth is clear.

The CHAIR: No, I do not think you would have any disagreement.

Thank you very much for your time today. I am sorry we kept you waiting. This is a matter of great public interest, so this matter is something we need to put to all the witnesses. Thanks for your evidence today. A transcript of the hearing will be forwarded to you for correction of minor errors. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days of 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. Thanks very much for your time.

Hearing concluded at 12.48 pm
