

PARLIAMENT OF NEW SOUTH WALES



STAYSAFE Committee

INQUIRY INTO ROAD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION AND MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE NEW SOUTH WALES ROAD SAFETY 2010 STRATEGY

Report of an inquiry into actions undertaken
by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the
road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005

New South Wales Parliamentary Library cataloguing-in-publication data:

New South Wales. Parliament. Legislative Assembly. STAYSAFE Committee

Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005. STAYSAFE Committee, Parliament NSW Legislative Assembly. [Sydney, NSW] : STAYSAFE Committee, 2006, 56 p.; 30cm

Chair: Paul Gibson MP, Chairman
December 2006

ISBN 0 xxxx xxxx x

1. STAYSAFE—New South Wales
 2. Road safety administration in New South Wales.
 3. Mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy
 4. Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- I Title.
- II Series: New South Wales. Parliament. Legislative Assembly. STAYSAFE Committee; STAYSAFE 80; Report 23/53

Table of Contents

Membership & Staff	5
Terms of reference	7
Chairman’s Foreword	9
Executive Summary	13
Chapter One – Introduction	17
Chapter Two – Road Safety Activities By The Agencies Within The Roads Portfolio, 2000-2000.....	21
Chapter Three –.....	
Chapter Four –.....	
Witnesses appearing before the STAYSAFE Committee	
Submissions received by the STAYSAFE Committee	
Appendix A—Extracts from the minutes of the STAYSAFE Committee	
Appendix B—Reports of the STAYSAFE Committee, 1982-2006	

Membership & Staff

Chairman	Mr Paul Gibson MP, Member for Blacktown
Members	Mr David Barr MP, Member for Manly
	Mr John Bartlett MP, Member for Port Stephens
	Ms Noreen Hay MP, Member for Wollongong
	Mr Jeff Hunter MP, Member for Lake Macquarie
	Mr Daryl Maguire MP, Member for Wagga Wagga (Opposition Whip)
	Hon. George Souris MP, Member for Upper Hunter
	Hon. Rick Colless MLC
	Hon. Robert Brown MLC
Staff	Hon. Ian West MLC (Vice Chairman)
	Mr Ian Faulks, Committee Manager
	Mr Jim Jefferis, Senior Committee Officer
	Ms Elayne Jay, Senior Committee Officer
	Ms Annette Phelps, Committee Officer
Contact Details	Ms Millie Yeoh, Assistant Committee Officer
	STAYS SAFE Committee
	Legislative Assembly
	Parliament House
	Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000
Telephone	(02) 9230 2161
Facsimile	(02) 9230 3309
E-mail	staysafe@parliament.nsw.gov.au
URL	www.parliament.nsw.gov.au

Terms of Reference

The STAYSAFE Committee

The general terms of reference of the STAYSAFE Committee are as follows:

- (1) As an ongoing task, the Committee is to-
 - (a) monitor, investigate and report on the road safety situation in New South Wales; and
 - (b) review and report on counter measures aimed at reducing deaths, injuries, and the social and economic costs to the community arising from road accidents.

Without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the following are to be given urgent consideration -

- (i) countermeasures aimed at traffic accidents associated with alcohol and other drugs.
- (ii) traffic law enforcement measures and their effectiveness.
- (iii) a review of human factors affecting traffic accidents, especially those relating to driver and rider licensing requirements and standards.
- (iv) the social and economic impact of deaths and serious debilitating injuries resulting from traffic accidents.
- (v) heavy vehicle safety.

CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD

Paul Gibson MP
Chairman, STAYSAFE Committee

This inquiry by the STAYSAFE Committee documents the actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005, and also examines issues associated with road safety administration in New South Wales and progress in implementing the Road Safety 2010 strategy.

At the commencement of the 53rd Parliament in early 2003, the STAYSAFE Committee resolved to continue its past practice of reviews of the road safety situation in New South Wales. The New South Wales government's Road Safety 2010 strategy identifies and endorses the need for ongoing review of programs. The government has established targets for a 40% reduction in road trauma arising from road crashes by the year 2010. The achievement of this target requires a sustained effort that addresses road safety and the reduction of road trauma across the full complexity of a dynamic and constantly evolving road transport system in New South Wales.

The review process conducted by the STAYSAFE Committee enables a periodic 'snapshot' of the road safety situation, and is of valuable assistance in the development of a road transport system in New South Wales that provides for safer roads, safer vehicles, and safer road users.

In fulfilment of the STAYSAFE Committee's terms of reference to monitor, investigate and report on the road safety situation in New South Wales, the Committee has conducted annual reviews of road safety, with Questions on Notice submitted to Ministers with portfolio responsibilities in the road transport area or in areas involving the use of roads or motor vehicles, and a public hearing to examine specific aspects of road safety arising from the answers received. The review process has been a successful device to obtain and maintain a detailed record of road safety-related activities in New South Wales.

The STAYSAFE Committee conducted six formal reviews of the annual road safety situation in New South Wales to date (1994-1999). The Committee had commenced a review of the 2000 road safety situation in New South Wales when the then Minister for Roads, the Hon. Carl Scully MP, announced that he was establishing a Ministerial Road Safety Task Force. In January 2001, the Road Safety Task Force was established to examine issues relating to an increase in road fatalities during the 15-day Christmas/New Year holiday period, and annual increases in the road toll in 1999 and 2000. The Task Force was specifically convened to:

- bring individual views, experience, knowledge and skills to this examination from a group of road safety experts, and
- make recommendations for improving the effectiveness of road safety interventions and initiatives in reducing the road toll over time and in avoiding a further rise in the toll.

The Ministerial Road Safety Task Force reported in May 2001, and released a series of recommendations for action.

The STAYSAFE Committee decided to defer its examination of the road safety situation to allow the implementation of the Ministerial Road Safety Task Force recommendations, and to report on the road safety situation in New South Wales over the period 2000-2005, which covers the period from the commencement to the mid-term of the Road Safety 2010 strategy as well as the implementation period for the Task Force recommendations.

The inquiry commenced in mid 2006. The terms of reference established for the inquiry into the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005, were:

The STAYSAFE Committee has written to relevant portfolios requesting advice regarding activities over the period 2000-2005 to improve road safety in New South Wales. Questions on notice have been forwarded to:

- Roads
- Police
- Health
- Education and Training
- Transport
- Special Minister of State (Motor Accidents Authority)
- Minister for Commerce (WorkCover Authority)
- Attorney General
- Environment (Environment Protection Authority)

As well, a general query letter will be forwarded to:

- Agriculture
- Fair Trading

The inquiry will review, where relevant to findings and recommendations arising from the reports released in the 52nd Parliament (STAYSAFE51 - STAYSAFE 60).

The inquiry will not be advertised generally.

Concurrently, in 2004 the STAYSAFE Committee commenced an inquiry into the Roads and Traffic Authority and road safety administration in New South Wales. The inquiry examined:

- The role of the Roads and Traffic Authority in road safety activities in New South Wales
- The responsibilities of government agencies, other than the Roads and Traffic Authority, and non-governmental organisations in improving the road safety situation in New South Wales
- The relationships between the Roads and Traffic Authority and other government agencies and non-governmental organisations involved in road safety activities
- and any other related matters

Over 2004-2006, the STAYSAFE Committee has taken evidence relating to several program areas within the overall road safety effort in New South Wales, including:

- Road trauma and road safety statistics and information;;
- Traffic enforcement activities;
- Road safety education;
- Heavy vehicle safety;
- Local government road safety; and
- Young drivers

These inquiries are now merged, with the release of a series of portfolio reports assessing the road safety situation in New South Wales over the 2000-2005 period, a mid-term review of the Road Safety 2010 strategy, and aspects of road safety administration in New South Wales.

This report of the examination of the Roads portfolio, and specifically the Roads and Traffic Authority, will be valuable in allowing the community to gain a better appreciation of the New South Wales government's priorities for road safety programs and policies.

Acknowledgments

As the end of the 53rd Parliament approaches, I am mindful of the care and diligence of my colleagues on the STAYSAFE Committee in conducting one of the most important of tasks faced by a Member of Parliament in New South Wales—addressing the unnecessary (and, in my view, avoidable) tragedy of road trauma associated with the operation of our State's road transport network.

Finally, on behalf of the Members of the STAYSAFE Committee, I wish to thank my Committee Manager, Mr Ian Faulks, for the exemplary manner in which he has conducted the administrative, procedural and research activities required of this inquiry, and for the way he, assisted by, has prepared this review report. I thank also Mr Jim Jefferis, Senior Committee Officer, Ms Elayne Jay, Senior Committee Officer, Ms Annette Phelps, Committee Officer, and Ms Millie Yeoh, Assistant Committee Officer, for their administrative assistance. Ms Ashika Cyril, previously Assistant Committee Officer also provided assistance during 2005.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this report, STAYSAFE has examined the actions undertaken by the Roads portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales.

Since 1994, systematic reviews of the road safety situation in New South Wales have satisfied the STAYSAFE Committee's terms of reference to monitor review and investigate road safety matters. In keeping with these requirements, STAYSAFE reports have focused on the themes that underpin the work of the Committee: transparency, accessibility, and accountability.

The review process involves examining the road safety activities of selected agencies and organisations. STAYSAFE conducted its monitoring and review procedures by first asking the agencies a series of questions. Formal written briefs were provided in response from the Minister. Formal hearings were then held where agency representatives had the opportunity to respond in more detail regarding the Roads portfolio's road safety activities and initiatives between 2000 and 2005.

The Roads portfolio essentially comprises one agency, the Roads and Traffic Authority. The Roads and Traffic Authority is the lead agency for the management of the road transport system of New South Wales, in conjunction with state and local government agencies. The Roads and Traffic Authority's customers and stakeholders include individuals, private organisations, our staff, community and road transport groups, local councils, and State and Federal government agencies. The Authority has four main responsibilities: managing the road network to achieve consistent travel times; providing road capacity and maintenance solutions; testing and licensing drivers; registering and inspecting vehicles; and improving road safety.

Overall, property, plant and equipment, private sector provided infrastructure and other non-current assets are worth \$73 billion. This includes Roads and Traffic Authority managed infrastructure with a written down value of more than \$69 billion.

On 11 September 2006, Mr Les Wielinga was appointed as Chief Executive of the Roads and Traffic Authority. Mr Wielinga noted a number of highlights in addressing road safety issues in the 2000-2005 period. These included New South Wales' fatality rate per population of 7.5 deaths per 100,000 in 2005—the lowest since records commenced in 1908. International comparisons show that New South Wales fatality rate is half that of the United States and two-thirds that of New Zealand. Fatalities have fallen in relation to distance travelled from 3.4 fatalities per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled in 1979 to less than 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled. Other highlights include the introduction of 50km/h urban speed zones; the provision of \$7.8 million for the Enhanced Enforcement Program which achieved an extra 28,144 hours of police enforcement resulting in 122,021 traffic infringement notices being issued issuing the program.

In implementing the Road Safety 2010 Strategy, the Authority noted that there were a number of factors, such as the State's inability to mandate safer vehicles, outside its control.

The Road Safety 2010 strategy indicated the Courts may be given power to impound vehicles of drivers caught driving under the influence. However, of more immediate concern to the Roads and Traffic Authority is the use of the provisions under section 10 of the Act, particularly in relation to high range blood-alcohol concentration offences. Current data suggests there has been a dramatic reduction in section 10s in relation to high range offences and their use in mid- and lower-range offences is also reducing.

In November 2004, a paper entitled: Improving Safety for Young Drivers was released for community comment. Following the consultation, a number of decisions were implemented including limiting the power of vehicles that a young novice driver can drive. Vehicles banned are V8s, petrol turbo or supercharged vehicles, vehicles with modified engines, and a number of other specific vehicles, for example, six-cylinder vehicles that are particularly powerful.

Older drivers are becoming an increasing proportion of the population and more people in their retirement are taking extensive trips. At the age of 80, medical tests are required and at 85 drivers must undergo driving tests. A licence may or may not be reissued depending on the result. In some circumstances, a limited licence will be issued which limits the driver to a certain number of kilometres from home.

The Roads and Traffic Authority is concerned that a number of studies have shown that illegal drugs are a significant factor in road crashes. A study of fatally injured drivers reflected that over 20% have been affected by drugs. New legislation will allow police the power to do random roadside testing for three illegal drugs, speed, ecstasy and marijuana, through oral fluid samples.

Enhanced Enforcement Programs are designed to be high profile because the research suggests that the best use of the available resources is to combine advertising and promotion of the fact that police are doing these programs, with the programs themselves. Programs can be undertaken at both the State level or the community level. These programs have been very successful, resulting in substantial reductions in fatalities.

New South Wales works through its representative on the Australian Transport Council to influence Australian design rules. At the most recent Australian Transport Council meeting held in Sydney in June 2006 there were design related issues discussed. The issues raised were electronic stability control and reversing sensors. Both were put forward to be progressed as part of the Australian Transport Council's work program.

Eighty per cent of the interstate freight in Australia goes through, arrives in, or emanates from New South Wales. The Roads and Traffic Authority is concerned to ensure the increasing safety of New South Wales heavy vehicle fleet through a large program of checking stations, including mobile checking stations and the Safe-T-Cam program, which checks safe driving hours, et cetera. The Safe-T-Cam program is a

series of cameras over the network, which only exist currently in New South Wales and South Australia. Data from the checking stations indicate that New South Wales vehicles have a lower rate of defects than vehicles from other States. In addition, New South Wales has introduced speed deeming legislation. This legislation recognises that the driver may be under pressure to drive unsafely.

There have been a number of changes to the Auslink model for funding from the Federal Government. Funding for all land transport is now drawn from a single pool. As a result, nationally important roads compete with rail and other transport modes for those Federal funds. As well, the Commonwealth is no longer accepting responsibility for funding 100 per cent of the works on the former national highways. Commonwealth funding for the former national roads has been reduced and the Safety and Urgent Minor works program no longer exists.

Research indicates that there has been a 90% reduction in fatalities at the locations of Fixed Digital Speed Cameras. A length of road is only eligible for a Fixed Digital Speed Camera if it meets two criteria. One is a certain rate of crashes and the other is that a certain rate of vehicles speeding along it. In order to demonstrate that the Government is not solely interested in raising revenue the fine for low level speeding has been reduced from \$130 to \$75. To ensure there is still an effective deterrent, demerit points have been increased from two to three.

Chapter One—

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The STAYSAFE Committee's terms of reference require that:

"as an ongoing task, the Committee is to—

- (a) monitor, investigate and report on the road safety situation in New South Wales; and
- (b) review and report on countermeasures aimed at reducing deaths, injuries, and the social and economic costs to the community arising from road accidents."

1.2 In reports issued over the past decade, STAYSAFE has discussed the strong themes that underpin the work of the STAYSAFE Committee: transparency, accessibility, and accountability. Systematic reviews of the road safety situation in New South Wales both satisfy the terms of reference from Parliament for STAYSAFE to monitor, review and investigate road safety matters, and serve to address the themes of transparency, accessibility, and accountability identified by STAYSAFE.

1.3 Commencing with an examination of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1994, STAYSAFE has conducted reviews on a regular basis. The review process involves examining the road safety activities of selected agencies and organisations, and, in particular, examining the road safety activities of the Roads and Traffic Authority. The Roads and Traffic Authority is the lead agency for road safety in New South Wales.

1.4 STAYSAFE conducted annual reviews of the road safety situation in New South Wales, covering the years 1994-1999, issuing six reports:

Review of the road safety situation in 1994	STAYSAFE 31 (1996)
Review of the road safety situation in 1995	STAYSAFE 41 (1996)
Review of the road safety situation in 1996	STAYSAFE 42 (1996)
Review of the road safety situation in 1997	STAYSAFE 47 (1996)
Review of the road safety situation in 1998	STAYSAFE 51 (2000)
Review of the road safety situation in 1999	STAYSAFE 55 (2002)

1.5 A review of the reviews of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 2000 was commenced, but was discontinued. The end of 2000 saw what was widely perceived as a 'road safety crisis'. The road toll during the Christmas-New Year holiday period in New South Wales was 38 deaths. This was the worst holiday road toll in New South Wales for a decade, and comprised just under half of the 80 road deaths nationally for the 2000 holiday period. Moreover, the total number of road deaths in New South Wales for the 2000 calendar year was 603, exceeding 600 for the first time since 1995. This was a serious failure of the Road Safety 2000 strategy, as the then Premier, the Hon. Bob Carr MP, had committed to a target of less than 500 road

deaths. And the shorter term trend was ominous, as road deaths in New South Wales had increased by around 4% each year since 1998.

1.6 The then Minister for Roads, the Hon. Carl Scully MP, announced in early January 2001 that he had established a Ministerial Road Safety Task Force.

1.7 The Ministerial Road Safety Task Force (2001) clearly placed its work in the context of the Road Safety 2010 road safety strategy for New South Wales:

The comments, perceptions and conclusions in this report reflect the intent and framework of Road Safety 2010 and recognised strategies being developed internationally. (p.9)

1.8 The Ministerial Road Safety Task Force (2001) formulated 31 recommendations across four broad areas: driver and rider education and behaviour; technology; enforcement and deterrence; and, monitoring and evaluation.

Review activities of the STAYSAFE Committee

1.9 This section describes the process whereby STAYSAFE conducts a systematic review of the road safety situation in New South Wales, and indicates the presentation format of the outcomes of the review. STAYSAFE conducts its monitoring and review activities by first asking a number of agencies involved in road safety a series of general questions about their calendar year activities, with the responses requested as formal written briefings from the responsible Minister or chief executive. STAYSAFE then holds a public hearing where representatives of these agencies can answer further, more specific questions related to the matters raised in the written briefings. The general questions address such issues as the nature of any research projects concerning road safety or traffic management; details of community surveys; details of published research, standards, codes of practice, and guidelines; details of speeches given by officials on road safety and traffic management topics; summaries of road safety curriculum development activities; summaries of road safety community awareness activities; and details of advertising, publicity and community relations activities. The further questions asked in public hearings relate to specific issues raised in the written briefings, to questions of clarification, or to relevant matters arising from previous inquiries and other research activity undertaken by STAYSAFE.

1.10 This report addresses both general and specific aspects of the road safety situation in New South Wales over the period 2000-2005 as it pertained to the Roads and Traffic Authority, an agency under the Roads portfolio. The following chapter and appendices of the report document the information forwarded to STAYSAFE through written responses from the Minister and the testimony of Departmental officials in public hearings to gather further specific information.

1.11 STAYSAFE forwarded a series of questions to the Minister for Roads, requesting written briefings. Subsequently, representatives of the Roads and Traffic Authority attended a public hearing where more specific questions relating to matters

raised in the written briefings are canvassed. The following chapter contains an edited record of both the written and verbal responses. The material is organised as follows:

- The general subject being examined is indicated, for example:
Provision of advice concerning road safety legislation
- The written questions (if any) asked by STAYSAFE are indicated with the prefix: **QUESTION**
- The Minister's written briefings received in answer to the questions are prefixed: **RESPONSE**
- Specific questions asked in the hearings seeking a verbal responses are indicated by prefixing them with the name of the STAYSAFE Member asking the question, for example, **Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN)**
- Answers to the specific questions asked in the hearings are indicated by prefixing them with the name of the witness answering the question, for example, **Mr WIELINGA**.
- Where appropriate, STAYSAFE may provide comment or additional information, as indicated by: **COMMENT**

The Roads portfolio

The Roads portfolio essentially comprises one agency, the Roads and Traffic Authority. The Roads and Traffic Authority was established on 16 January 1989, under the Transport Administration Act 1988, through an amalgamation of the former Department of Main Roads, Department of Motor Transport, and the Traffic Authority.

The Roads and Traffic Authority is the lead agency for the management of the road transport system of New South Wales, in conjunction with state and local government agencies. The Roads and Traffic Authority's customers and stakeholders include individuals, private organisations, our staff, community and road transport groups, local councils, and State and Federal government agencies. The Roads and Traffic Authority participates in various external committees such as Austroads Council and the Standing Committee on Transport (SCOT). Austroads undertakes nationally strategic research on behalf of Australasian road agencies, promotes improved practice, facilitates collaboration and consistency and provides expert advice to the Australian Transport Council (ATC) and SCOT.

The Roads and Traffic Authority has four main responsibilities

- Managing the road network to achieve consistent travel times.
- Providing road capacity and maintenance solutions.
- Testing and licensing drivers and registering and inspecting vehicles.
- Improving road safety.

The Roads and Traffic Authority is responsible for assets comprising:

- 17,776 km of State Roads and management of 3,105 km of National Highways and nearly 2,962 km of Regional Roads and Local Roads.
- Various roundabouts, signs and line markings
- 4,867 bridges including major culverts
- 3,410 traffic signal sites
- Nine vehicular ferries
- Road tunnels

Overall, property, plant, equipment, private sector provided infrastructure and other non-current assets are worth \$73 billion. This includes Roads and Traffic Authority-managed infrastructure with a written down value of more than \$69 billion.

The Roads and Traffic Authority receives funding of \$2.8 billion including State and Commonwealth contributions and road user charges. The Roads and Traffic Authority provides financial assistance to local councils to manage 18,487 km of Regional Roads and to a lesser extent, Local Roads.

As of 30 April 2005, the Roads and Traffic Authority employed the equivalent of 6,869 full-time staff in more than 180 offices across New South Wales, including 131 motor registries. In 2005, the Roads and Traffic Authority completed approximately 19 million registration and licensing transactions for the 4.4 million drivers and 4.8 million registered vehicles in New South Wales.

Chapter Two—

ROAD SAFETY ACTIVITIES BY THE AGENCIES WITHIN THE ROADS PORTFOLIO, 2000-2005

Introductory remarks

The following Roads and Traffic Authority portfolio witnesses appeared before STAYSAFE on Monday 18 September 2006, representing the Honourable Eric Rozzendaal MLC, Minister for Roads:

Mr Les Wielinga, Chief Executive, Roads and Traffic Authority

Mr Michael Bushby, Director, Road Safety, Driver and Vehicle Regulation, Roads and Traffic Authority

Dr Soames Job, General Manager, Road Safety Strategy, Roads and Traffic Authority

Appointment of new Chief Executive for the Roads and Traffic Authority

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Mr Wielinga, I extend my congratulations and the STAYSAFE Committee's congratulations on your recent appointment as chief executive of the Roads and Traffic Authority. The Committee has met you in the past on a few occasions and hopes to do so more frequently in the future.

COMMENT: STAYSAFE notes that on Monday 11 September 2006, the Roads Minister, the Hon. Eric Rozzendaal MLC, announced that Mr Les Wielinga had been selected for appointment as the Chief Executive of the Roads and Traffic Authority following the forced resignation of Mr Paul Forward. The Minister for Roads indicated that the new Chief Executive has been charged with particular responsibility to:

- Refocus the Roads and Traffic Authority on roads project construction and delivery;
- Efficiently reopen roads to improve traffic flow around the Sydney Central Business District;
- Increase the usage of electronic tags on the Sydney Orbital and toll roads;
- Develop plans for a cashless Sydney Harbour Tunnel;
- Implement the M5 East Air Quality Improvement Plan;
- Work with the Commonwealth government to efficiently deliver the Hume and Pacific Highway upgrades;
- Implement the lemma Government's school road safety package;
- Develop plans to address the current road toll; and

- Improve transparency and the public access to information in the Roads and Traffic Authority.

Highlights concerning road safety activities over the 2000-2005 period

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): ... Mr Wielinga, what have been the highlights in addressing road safety issues over the past five or six years?

Mr WIELINGA: Thank you for the opportunity to provide a road safety update. When one looks at opportunities one must look at a long-term view as well as the recent five years. If one looks at the 60-year low in fatalities during 2005, that followed on from a 2004 road toll of 510, which was the previous lowest figure since 1947. The road toll for 2005 has now been finalised at 508, which is equal with 1946 as the lowest toll since the Second World War. This is despite there being 30 times as many vehicles on the roads, 10 times as many licensed drivers and double the population compared to 1945.

The New South Wales fatality rate per population of 7.5 deaths per 100,000 in 2005 was the lowest since records commenced in 1908. That means the fatality rate per 100,000 population is now a quarter of what it was three decades ago. International comparisons show our fatality is half that in the United States of America and two-thirds of the rate in New Zealand. The road toll for 2006 as of midnight last Thursday 14 September 2006 stood at 372, which is on a par for the same period last year. This is despite the road toll in March being 46 above the same period last year.

The Roads and Traffic Authority continues to work in conjunction with partnering agencies and the good work that this Committee does to refine our approach to road safety on our road network. The current fatality rate per vehicle and per kilometre travelled is at historic lows, with a 90 per cent reduction in fatalities since the end of the Second World War. Fatalities in relation to distance travelled have fallen from 3.4 fatalities per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled in 1979 to less than one fatality per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled. Fatalities per vehicle have fallen from 13.2 per 10,000 vehicles in 1950 to about 1.2 per 10,000 vehicles.

Some of the major initiatives introduced to achieve this result over the past five years—and addressing the key question—include the introduction of 50 km/h urban speed zones. This has resulted in up to a 20 per cent reduction in crashes on the relevant urban roads. This Committee played a key roll in that recommendation. The introduction of 40 km/h pedestrian zones has also increased safety. In 2006 so far there have been 14 fewer pedestrians killed for the same period last year. An independent evaluation showed a 90 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 20 per cent reduction in injuries at locations at which speed cameras have been used. Last year the Roads and Traffic Authority provided \$7.8 million for the Enhanced Enforcement Program. That achieved an extra 28,144 hours of police enforcement, resulting 122,021 traffic infringement notices being issued during the program.

The new Crashlab facility at Huntingwood is the only government-owned road safety facility of its kind in Australia. It provides comprehensive research capabilities and unbiased testing of vehicle occupant and road user protection technology and equipment. The Crashlab facilities include a comprehensive indoor vehicle crash barrier, a crash test dummy maintenance and calibration laboratory, and a dynamic crash lead for testing child restraints, seatbelts, bus seats and wheelchair restraints. The comprehensive helmet laboratory includes a drop-test tower for industrial safety harnesses, arrest devices and an outdoor test area for roadside infrastructure crashworthiness.

A total of \$25.49 million is being spent this financial year on 101 sites that have been identified as needing improvements under the Roads and Traffic Authority's crash reduction program, traditionally known as the Black Spot Program. The program has provided road safety improvements at more than 600 identified sites at a cost of more than \$103 million in the past five years and has made a significant contribution to lowering the State's road toll. Total funding for this program has increased over recent years.

The Pacific Highway Safety Review was published in May 2004 and was undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority's Road Safety Strategy Branch. The review resulted in setting up a specific program of safety remedial treatment works and enhanced enforcement with a funding allocation of \$45 million over a three-year period from 2003-04 to 2005-6. The program was completed on time in June 2006 and has already had an effect in reducing the number of fatal crashes on the highway. The number of fatalities fell from 55 in 2003 to 32 in 2004 and 33 in 2005. The number of fatal crashes fell from 43 in 2003 to 26 and 25 in 2004 and 2005 respectively.

The Princes Highway Safety Review was published in December 2004. Again, the review was undertaken by our Road Safety Strategy Branch. The review resulted in the setting up of specific programs of safety remedial treatment works with a funding allocation of \$30 million over a three-year period from 2004-05 to 2006-07. The program of works will be completed in June 2007, but there has already been a reduction in the number of fatal crashes on the highway. The number of fatalities fell from 24 in 2004 to 12 in 2005 and fatal crashes fell from 19 in 2004 to 11 in 2005.

In the school safety area the Government has introduced the following initiatives: 40 km/h school zones throughout the State; school zones speed cameras; and comprehensive school education programs. The Child Safety Package has been announced this year, including the following initiatives: 50 more speed cameras in school zones; electronic warning systems; drop-off, pick-up zones for schools; increased penalties for school zone offences; and the child safety round table. The Heavy Vehicle Seatbelt Education Program has resulted in truckies always wearing seatbelts increasing from 39 per cent to 48 per cent and the introduction of speed limiters for heavy vehicles. This gives an indication of some of the initiatives that have been introduced over the past five years and I hope that that addresses the question.

Understanding of, and commitment to, the Road Safety 2010 strategy

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): In relation to the Road Safety 2010 strategy, in general, what actions have been taken since 2000 and, more particularly, over the past one or two years, to foster that debate and to promote understanding of and commitment to the strategy?

Dr JOB: Mr Wielinga has just outlined many of the initiatives we have introduced. To go back more broadly to the outline of that program, there are a couple of things we can add to what has already been identified. The program for the 2010 Strategy outlines four areas: Safer vehicles, safer roads, safer road users and community action. The two that have not been extensively discussed so far are community action and safer vehicles. In terms of community action, the Roads and Traffic Authority constantly runs community education programs. This year, for example, we have seen the release of the Paranoia Campaign, promoting concern based on mobile speed cameras, to try to deter people further from drink driving. Numerous similar campaigns have been conducted throughout the year dealing with fatigue, speed and so on.

In addition, we run local, much more specific community education programs, partly by virtue of using our core materials and then localising the media. For example, we might have a council that will use our background poster with details saying that in the local community 14 people were killed speeding last year, or whatever. That program of community involvement is primarily run by road safety officers. We have road safety officers servicing just over 100 councils in the State. That program is jointly funded by the Roads and Traffic Authority and the relevant councils.

The other issue which remains to be addressed but which has not been addressed for particular reasons other than identifying our crash lab is vehicle safety. The reason is a complex set of conditions that limit the extent to which New South Wales as a jurisdiction can control the safety of vehicles. We do everything, I think extremely effectively, that can be done from the point of view of a State; that is, we are the lead State in terms of the Australian New Car Assessment Program [ANCAP], by which we promote safer vehicles as a community exercise. That program is funded by all of the States, the motoring bodies and New Zealand. We are the single largest State Government funder of that program. We promote safer vehicles to the community.

However, as a state jurisdiction we cannot control and limit through the Australian Design Rules the kind of vehicle that is available for purchase, either locally manufactured or imported. That is a Federal Government controlled initiative. One of the reasons for what I see as being incomplete progress in this area is that the Australian Design Rules have not kept up with the available technology and safety features that could be put into vehicles.

We are promoting those to the community, but we cannot control the bottom end by virtue of regulation of them. We are seeing concerning consequences of that. For example, one high-profile vehicle went from a four-star car in its previous model to a

two-star car this year. That is very disappointing for us. It reflects the fact that, even though the technology is available to maintain a car at a four- or indeed five-star vehicle, even for a small vehicle, we have seen a drop to a two because we do not have Australian design rules that mandate that it be of a higher standard.

Implementation of the Road Safety 2010 strategy

Ms HAY (STAYSAFE): Could you briefly outline how many of the major actions under the Road Safety 2010 strategy have been implemented? You may have partially answered the following question, that is, whether or not obstacles outside the Roads and Traffic Authority's control prevent safety targets being met.

Dr JOB: There are a number of ways in which those safety targets have been limited. The first is that expected benefits from safer vehicles have been only partially achieved because we do not actually have the ability as a State jurisdiction to mandate safer vehicles. We are certainly pushing the Federal Government to do more in that arena. For example, this year we have seen a push for reversing sensors and effective reversing technology to be added to vehicles. But that is not something that New South Wales can do alone.

Also, a number of assumptions contained within the Road Safety 2010 plan have not turned out to be correct. When you make a plan like this you make estimates of the way you expect the economy to go, and the way you expect travel to grow. Those estimates can turn out to be wrong. In fact, the New South Wales economy has grown so much that travel has grown much more than expected. We were expecting travel growth to be around 1 per cent per year, when in fact it has turned out to be more than 3 per cent per year. The accumulated result of that is that travel growth has been more than double what we were expecting. The more cars you have on the road the more exposure there is, and the more crashes you are likely to have. If you correct the estimates for improvements contained within that document only by virtue of changing the assumed travel to what has actually turned out to be the real growth in travel, in fact you explain two-thirds of the discrepancy between where we are now and where we expected to be. In other words, the primary reason for the discrepancy is simply the increase in travel.

There are other interesting little assumptions which, on looking back, appear odd. For example, one of the assumptions in the document—just to highlight one example—is that we were expecting benefits from mobile phones. No-one knew back in the late 1990s, when that document was prepared, that mobile phones would be used so much in vehicles and that they would be so distracting. The handheld mobile phone is quite a problem, but that was not anticipated. In fact, benefits were anticipated from mobile phones. So there was actually an estimate of an accumulated benefit made on the assumption that we would get more speedy response to crashes in remote areas because everyone would have mobile phone and would be able to ring in. But the net result of mobile phones has actually been a disbenefit.

Impoundment of motor vehicles driven by repeat drink driving offenders

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): The Road Safety 2010 strategy indicated the Courts may be given powers to impound vehicles of repeat drink-drivers. Has there been any leeway in that regard? Is one of your strategies to look at putting pressure on courts to impound the vehicles of drivers caught driving under the influence?

Dr JOB: The key pressure that we have been putting on the Courts is actually in relation to the use of section 10s for drink-driving. We have had big concerns about the use of section 10s, which means that while the facts of the case are found, no conviction is recorded and no penalty is applied. We, along with a number of other bodies, have been very successful by virtue of pushing for in-principle review of penalties for high range blood-alcohol concentration [BAC] offences. Not only have we seen a dramatic reduction in the use of section 10s for high range, but in fact the data suggest that that appears to be flowing through to the other blood alcohol concentration offences. So we are seeing a reduced use of section 10 in the mid-range and the low-range offences as well. I think that has been very effective, because the deterrence value we get from the catchment from drink-driving and in particular from random breath testing is a very important part of our strategy for dealing with drink-driving.

The fact that people come before the court also allows access to a number of other programs that we have in place to help with drink-driving. They are programs like the Traffic Offenders Program and, more recently, the Sober Driver Program, which our evaluations show are very effective, and the Breath Alcohol Interlock Program, which is also one where we rely on the magistrates to provide an order before someone is able to get onto that program. So I think we have a number of programs that are improving matters, and we rely on the magistrates for many of them. I think that relationship has improved.

Proposed New South Wales vehicle sanctions to better deal with unlicensed drivers and drivers of unregistered vehicles

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): My question is addressed to any of you gentlemen. In September 2003 the Roads and Traffic Authority released a discussion paper outlining a proposed New South Wales vehicle sanctions scheme to better deal with unauthorised or unlicensed drivers and people who drive unregistered motor vehicles. What has happened with this discussion paper and its policy proposals?

Mr BUSHBY: The vehicle sanctions scheme was announced and has been discussed in several forms since the date it was originally announced. How to implement such a scheme has been discussed at great length. The document that we would be looking to progress is still being developed, and it is subject to the Government making a decision on the direction that we would go with that. My preference would be to take the question on notice, if I could, and give you advice at a later date.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): It seems to me that since September 2003 there has been a lot of discussion, but I cannot understand why it has taken so long to deal with this issue. It is now 2006. What has it taken so long? What is the problem?

Mr BUSHBY: There are a lot of complexities in how you would implement such a scheme, in terms of whether it is on the roadside, et cetera. Those things have been considered and discussed. Coming up with a solution that is workable is a critical result of that. As I say, the issue is still being considered.

Novice drivers

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): Whilst we are on papers, can you brief the Committee on what has happened as a result of the release of "Improving Safety for Young Drivers", an options papers, for community comment in November 2004?

Dr JOB: I would be happy to answer that question. That paper was released in November 2004 for community comment, and in fact we collected considerable community interest on that. We made a number of decisions at the time, and those have subsequently been acted on. The decisions made were that we would implement a limit on the power of vehicles that a young novice driver could drive, and that program has been implemented. Basically, the program outlines a number of vehicles that are banned. Those include V8s, petrol turbo or supercharged vehicles, vehicles with modified engines, and a number of other specific vehicles six-cylinder vehicles that are particularly powerful. So that program is already in place.

Second, we identified a concern with a number of passengers that young drivers were carrying, and we implemented passenger restrictions for particular groups of people who have proven in other ways that they are potentially quite unsafe. So, in particular, the passenger restriction applies for one year upon returning to licensed driving after a young driver has had his or her licence taken away by the court.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): This morning we had a media article saying that the Minister for Roads suggested that training for drivers should be increased from 50 hours to 150 hours because of the increase in the number of young people on roads. It appears there was an increase in those statistics after the implementation of this policy. Do you see a link between the two?

Dr JOB: I think the statistics we have seen quoted in the newspapers do not accurately reflect the full extent of safety of young drivers, and I think they are quite misrepresentative. The reason I identify that is as follows. First of all, those statistics are only about young drivers where they are the fatality. If we have a broad concern with young drivers and their safety in the community, we should be concerned with every fatal crash in which a young driver is involved, not just the ones where they happen to be the victim. We are equally concerned if the victim is one of their own passengers, or a pedestrian, or an occupant of another vehicle, or a cyclist, et cetera. We believe that is the best data to reflect the safety of young drivers. I have those data with me, and those data show quite a different story from the data that we have

seen cited in the newspaper. Those data claimed a doubling of occasions on which P-plate drivers were killed.

The drivers that we focus on as a flowthrough of the GLS to give comparisons over the years are the P1 drivers, that is, those in the first year of provisional licensed driving. From 1 January to 14 September this year we have had 24 occasions of a P1 driver, not a motorcyclist, being involved in a fatal crash. In the same period last year we had 30. So, if you look at the total involvement of this group, in fact their involvement in fatal crashes has gone down this year relative to the same period last year. The data cited in the newspaper, we believe, are mistaken, first, by including only those occasions where the P-plater himself or herself is killed, and, second, we suspect they may also have included motorcyclists, who were not affected by this scheme, so that is not a sensible inclusion.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYS SAFE): Your information is contrary to what was printed in the tabloids. So where would the Minister's response have come from? Was it from that detailed information that you have that he suggests that another 100 hours be added to driver training for learners, or was the Minister's statement in response to the media article?

Dr JOB: It is neither. In fact, the suggestion that we increase required hours as a learner was actually one of the recommendations canvassed in the young driver discussion paper to which you referred earlier. The background and logic for it is not the particular detail. We are concerned about every young driver killed and every young driver involved where someone else is killed. That suggestion is based on interesting overseas research, which suggest that a substantial increase in the number of hours of supervised driving as a learner, that is, on-road supervised driving—not off-track skills training, but on-road supervised driving—gives you a significant road safety benefit. So the basis for that suggestion by the Minister is sound research from overseas that suggests the extension of those hours gives a road safety benefit.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Western Australia is going to 120 hours as we speak.

Dr JOB: It is good if we see more national consistency in terms of an increase in these hours.

Later, the following discussion took place:

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): How many P-plate drivers do we have in the State at the moment, just in ballpark figures?

Dr JOB: We do have that data with us. In ballpark figures we have around 300,000, including P1 and P2.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): With 26 young people being killed—and that is 26 too many we would all agree—that is 0.01 of 1 per cent. I note, particularly that the *Daily Telegraph*, in months gone by that 8, 10 and 12 people have been killed in a week and there has been nothing in the papers about that but every time there is a young person killed it is in the headlines in the papers. Surely something should be done to

give them the real figures—you probably do that—but we are talking about 0.01 of 1 per cent of people being killed but when you read the *Daily Telegraph* you would think there are hundreds of thousands of young people dying every month?

Dr JOB: I agree with everything you have said. You are quite right and in fact the rate is extremely low. Nonetheless, they are deaths and nonetheless they are too many—

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Exactly.

Dr JOB: And the more we can do about them the better.

Ms HAY (STAYS SAFE): I think you indicated earlier that the overall picture is distorted in terms of P-platers?

Dr JOB: As I said, I agree. It is distorted, especially by virtue of the selection of only those fatal crashes where it is the young driver being killed. That does not accurately represent the safety concerns we would have with these young drivers. I do have the exact figures here. In 2005 there were 135,000 P1 drivers and 2005 there were 176,000 P2 drivers.

Older drivers

Ms HAY (STAYS SAFE): What is the Roads and Traffic Authority doing for older drivers?

Dr JOB: You have certainly raised an issue that is of considerable concern to us. Older drivers are becoming an increasing proportion of the population. Our population is ageing, people are living longer and more actively, and more and more people in their retirement are taking extensive driving trips. This is of significant concern to us. New South Wales already has one of the most stringent schemes of any State for the licensing and retesting of older drivers. At the age of 80 we start medical tests and at 85 we start driving tests. We are one of the few jurisdictions that already has that in place. New South Wales already has a very strong program in place to check the appropriateness of licensing of drivers.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYS SAFE): What are the failure rates around the State of drivers aged 85 years plus? Do you have Roads and Traffic Authority figures that you can provide? I would like to know how one Roads and Traffic Authority region compares to another and how they are implementing driving test abilities to the letter of the law.

Dr JOB: We can take that on notice. However, it is worth noting that a consequence of that test can be several things. It can be that the driver is considered appropriate and the licence is reissued. It can be that the drive is considered unsafe and no licence is reissued. Or it can be that the drive is considered safe in some circumstances and a limited licence is issued, such as a licence that limits the person to a certain number of kilometres from home.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): I would like to know how each region manages the test and whether the average number of people losing their licences or being given restricted licences is comparable.

Mr BUSHBY: Once older drivers reach 85 years old, testing is consistent across the State. We have a modified form of the Driving Assessment Test, which is done by people on their P plates. Older drivers do not have to do a three-point turn or a reverse park, but they are required to do all the other elements of the Driving Assessment Test. We have a group of driving assessors who check the consistency of application of driving tests in every one of our motor registries around the State. We have a group that does nothing except check the consistency not only in the numbers you are talking about but also in the application of the process. When you apply to do a driver's licence test one of the conditions is that the test may be monitored by one of the supervising driving assessors to check consistency is in an audit process across the State.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): Are those reports available to the public?

Mr BUSHBY: I would have to take that on notice. I am not sure.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): If they are not available to the public, can they be made available to the STAYSAFE Committee so that we can understand what the supervisor does?

Mr BUSHBY: I will certainly get what information we can about the driver testing assessment process.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): How often do these assessors go to the Roads and Traffic Authority offices to carry out their work, and how many are there?

Mr BUSHBY: I think there are about 10 people doing it full time.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): There are 10 throughout New South Wales and how often would they visit each Roads and Traffic Authority centre?

Mr BUSHBY: Several times a year.

Drug driving

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): In terms of drug usage and driving—and, obviously, drugs meaning other than alcohol—could you give us some indication as to the work being done to address that particular issue?

Dr JOB: Yes, we certainly could. We are concerned about the use of drugs other than alcohol as a driving factor and the background data we have from a number of studies indicates that illegal drugs are a significant factor in road crashes; in fact, drugs in total are a significant factor in road crashes. A study of fatally injured drivers reflected that over 20 per cent had drugs on board, which could have affected their driving.

That study includes illegal and illegal drugs. For example, sleeping pills will affect your capacity to drive; they are legal but they will still affect your capacity to drive.

What we are doing is we have legislation coming before the Parliament—in fact, I think it has already been to first reading—which is to introduce two major pieces of enforcement change. The first is it allows police the power to do random roadside testing for drugs. This is analogous to the introduction of random breath testing. In fact, this legislation is in addition to already existing legislation. So legislation already exists within New South Wales so that a driver can be charged with driving under the influence of a drug. The way that works is police form the view that a driver's driving is impaired, yet breath alcohol sampling indicates that there is no alcohol or insufficient alcohol on board to explain their impaired driving. They are then able to arrest that driver and take body fluid for sampling for drugs. That driver can be charged with driving under the influence of drugs on the basis of the combined evidence that their driving was impaired, it was not explained by alcohol, and they have relevant drugs in their system. In fact, that legislation is used by police. There are over 900 offences a year laid under that existing legislation.

The problem with that kind of legislation, however, is that it does not provide as effective a deterrent as random testing does. That is because most of us are very confident of our capacity to drive, including driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. So in the same way as random breath testing produced a dramatic reduction in drink driving, we believe random roadside drug testing will give us a significant reduction in the problem of drugs in driving. That random roadside testing allows police to take an oral fluid sample, saliva, and test for three illegal drugs: speed, ecstasy and marijuana. The charge is actually not laid on the basis of the random roadside test, the random roadside test is, in effect, a screening. The saliva sample is then sent to the Division of Analytical Laboratories for analysis on the basis of confirming the presence of those drugs at the Division of Analytical Laboratories, and a charge of driving with these drugs on board is laid against that driver.

The second thing this legislation introduces is the power to drug-test drivers and those supervising a learning driver involved in a fatal crash. So if a driver or the supervisor of a learning driver is involved in a fatal crash, the police can arrest that driver or supervisor, take them to an appropriate medical location and have a blood sample drawn. That blood sample can then be analysed for numerous drugs, not just those three that we know we can reliably find in saliva. The legislation, which is before the Parliament to consider, addresses the issue of the capacity to identify numerous drugs following a fatal crash involvement.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): There is no blood testing at all with the new legislation?

Dr JOB: There is blood testing in the fatals one; there is not blood testing in the random roadside test.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): So there is only the saliva test?

Dr JOB: Right.

Mr BARR (STAYSAFE): Will there be concurrently then breath testing as well for alcohol? Will people be doing the two tests: the mouth swab—or whatever it is—plus breathing into the breathalyser?

Dr JOB: That is an operational matter for police. There is nothing in the legislation that prohibits police from doing both at once. We understand, however, that the police plan is to target the random roadside drug testing to locations where we expect we would have more of it: locations where people are leaving major parties on a Saturday night or five in the morning on a Sunday; and heavy vehicle locations, because the data suggests that heavy vehicle drivers are more likely to be using drugs to stay awake than are other drivers.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Back to the blood testing: if a driver gets picked up and a saliva test is taken, if the driver wants to be blood tested the same as in random breath testing, has he or she got that option?

Dr JOB: I would have to take that question on notice. My understanding of the full process is this: there is an initial screening test—which I think the vernacular is it is a lick test—where the driver licks a little pad. If that shows a positive they are then taken to the drug testing bus and a more complete saliva sample is taken. That saliva sample is then tested again at the bus. If that test is negative the driver is sent on their way. If that test is positive then the remainder of that sample is sent to the Division of Analytical Laboratories. My understanding is that the driver can ask for a retest of a proportion of that saliva sample since it is actually the saliva sample which is the basis for the charge, not a blood sample.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): If you could come back to us whether they have got the right to call for a blood sample?

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): If the driver passes the breath test, passes the lick test, but looks fairly unstable, what happens at that point?

Dr JOB: At that point if the police officer's view is that this driver is actually impaired, then what the data would suggest is they are impaired by something but it is not alcohol, it is not marijuana, it is not speed and it is not ecstasy. There are still numerous other drugs they could have on board that could cause impairment.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): So then you go back to the old legislation?

Dr JOB: Then we could go back to the old legislation and the police could say, "This driver is clearly impaired. We do not have an explanation of it in terms of what we have already done". They are able to arrest that driver under the existing legislation and have a more complete sampling process taken in which we could test for numerous drugs.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): And they blood test them?

Dr JOB: That is a blood test, yes.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): It is a bit of a worry though that in the typical line-up of a random testing operation the cars pretty well all slow down to virtually zero in the queue, so they are not really going to exhibit any sort of behaviour that would make the police suspicious. I have a feeling there is going to be a lot of people pass that test and they have got heroin sitting right there.

Dr JOB: I have more faith in it than you. I have been out on numerous occasions with police in the process of the introduction of random breath testing and in the process of doing audits of our enhanced enforcement program and the police stun me in terms of their capacity to identify an impaired driver. It would not surprise me at all to find that as they are stepping out there and looking at the traffic the power will mean that they can identify an impaired driver. I have driven down three-lane complex roads with them and they have said to me, "That one there, three cars up, two across in such and such car, that one". They will pull them over and, bingo, they will have a positive.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): But they know you are a leading executive in the Roads and Traffic Authority.

Dr JOB: They still have the capacity to do it, regardless of my presence.

The enhanced enforcement program and other traffic policing operations to support road safety

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): Mr Wielinga, in your opening remarks you made reference to the fact that the Roads and Traffic Authority had supplied enhancement funding to the Police Service and that that gave greater presence and resulted in extra infringements being issued. Can you advise the Committee whether you have allocated more funds for such high-profile operations, when such operations were conducted previously, and whether we can expect to see more of these high-profile operations to December this year and for the first three months of next year? Do you have funds allocated for high-profile operations until the end of the first quarter?

Mr WIELINGA: It is important I make the point that the Roads and Traffic Authority works very closely with Police and other agencies in road safety programs. There will be programs leading up to Christmas with enhanced enforcement. Dr Job will give you the detail.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): And I would be interested to know about enhancement programs for the first quarter of next year.

Dr JOB: You are certainly right in identifying these programs as high profile. They are designed very explicitly to be high profile, because the research suggests that the best use of our resource is to actually combine advertising and promotion of the fact that police are doing these programs, with the programs themselves. That strategy will continue maintaining this high profile at a State level when it is actually a State

program or at a local community level when it is a program specific to various areas of the State. These programs have been very successful for us and we have seen very substantial reductions where we have specifically put them in. The earliest one was actually in Western Sydney where we saw a dramatic reduction in fatalities in Western Sydney when we implemented that, so we have extended that model.

What gives us a lot of benefit in those models, particularly in country areas where we have an overrepresentation of serious crashes, is that the police have taken from numerous other areas, so that we do not have concern with the local factors and local knowledge or lack of local knowledge or the belief that they can predict where the local police officer will be. Many of these programs work by taking police from Lithgow, Orange and Dubbo and doing the program in Bathurst, or taking from Bathurst and doing the program wherever. We plan to continue that kind of approach with high-profile targeting.

In terms of our funding, our funding expenditure has steadily gone up over the years, so it is continuing at a higher level. The extent to which we can plan it, however, is somewhat limited. It depends on police involvement and police ensuring that they have those resources and it depends on us ensuring that we can get the media out effectively with it, so I could not tell you exactly when that will happen in the first quarter of next year.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Are the local police advised of when it is going to happen or does the flying squad just turn up?

Dr JOB: It is actually more than that. They are not just involved or informed; they are actually directly involved in the planning, so they are involved from the beginning in planning the operation. In fact, in many of these operations the local police plan the operation, come to us with the plan and we say, "Yes, we can get the media out in time for that; we can put the promotion through". The local government road safety officer would get it out in the local newspapers through the council, et cetera, and we put that together as a partnership and the program goes ahead.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): So how long from the initial approach that the police make with the plan does it take the Roads and Traffic Authority to respond with the media and all the other things that you have to do as a department to make the campaign effective?

Dr JOB: It depends a lot on the size of the campaign. If it is quite a local one then we need relatively little time to plan it, because we have got to get local media, local publicity in that newspaper, local radio, et cetera. If it is a statewide campaign, we need a number of months ahead to ensure we are ready with major statewide promotion.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): How many of these proposals is the Roads and Traffic Authority now working towards?

Dr JOB: I could not give you an exact number but I could take that question on notice.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): Could you also take on notice to provide information as to when funds have been expended and where, and for the past three years on operations? Could you also provide a summary?

Dr JOB: We could do that.

Mr MAGUIRE (STAYSAFE): Could you also on notice provide to the Committee future planned operations and for the first quarter next year any information that you have available on discussions or approaches that may have been made or are to be made with regards to high-profile policing operations?

Dr JOB: We can take that on notice but bear in mind that plans we will have to this date will not represent the full extent of what will occur in the first quarter of next year because many more will be planned in the interim.

Motor vehicle safety and the Australian Design Rules

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): I wanted to ask about the Australian standards and I was disturbed to hear that a manufacturer has removed the safety aspects from a vehicle, presumably to lower the entry costs into Australia. The question relates to how the States and Commonwealth standards operate. When a State has a very strong issue, such as four-wheel drive vehicles needing reversing sensors because of the high-profile incidents that have occurred, it appears that the Australian standards are not under review and consequently vehicle manufacturers are not fitting those to vehicles. You said that New South Wales is not able to implement anything by itself. How then does New South Wales, and I assume other States, make its point and influence the Australian standards?

Mr BUSHBY: Dr Job has given an example in relation to the difficulty New South Wales has. That does not mean that we cannot have an influence over the arrangements. What we tend to do is actually work through the Minister. The Minister for Roads sits on the Australian Transport Council [ATC] and it meets twice year. The opportunity is there for any Minister to bring forward any issue of concern to them of their jurisdiction and they are able to bring that forward for discussion between the Ministers to make a resolution on a direction to go forward.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): What has happened about four-wheel drive vehicles reversing?

Mr BUSHBY: At the most recent Australian Transport Council meeting held here in Sydney in June 2006 there were two such design-related issues on the agenda mentioned in the communiqué that came out of it. They were electronic stability control, which was raised by the Queensland Minister, and reversing sensors, which was raised by Minister Roozendaal. Both of these have been put forward to be progressed as part of the Australian Transport Council work program to be put to the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Regional Services as to how to progress

those. Whether they become Australian design rules becomes a more difficult question and it is still ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Transport and Regional Services. They take into account other issues, not just the safety aspects.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Did New South Wales take the four-wheel drive reversing or all vehicles reversing?

Mr BUSHBY: Reversing is not just an issue of concern for four-wheel drives. It is actually about being able to see objects and we would rather take a performance approach, which says, "Let's look at the individual vehicle. What is the viewing angle out of the back? Can we come up with proximity sensors or cameras or other reversing aids that actually improve the situation in terms of being able to see out of the rear of vehicles"? It is wider than just four-wheel drives.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Making it such a wide issue, though, probably means it is going to be a much longer time before anything happens and four-wheel drive vehicles are really the focal point?

Mr BUSHBY: That is true. I think we are seeing some movement in the industry as well in terms of that becoming a selling point and a point of differentiation between manufacturers which, in itself, will help to progress the broad implementation across the new car fleet and then potentially be able to mandate it from that point on.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): I assume the Australian standards are run by a Commonwealth organisation. Do they have the sort of crash laboratory facility and sophistication that you have or do they take your information and progress from there?

Mr BUSHBY: They have skills in the area of vehicle design and vehicle standards but they do not have a crash laboratory. In fact, we do work for them indirectly in our Crashlab.

Projected increases in road freight transport and the implications for road safety

The Hon. ROBERT BROWN (STAYSAFE): Dr Job, in an earlier answer you indicated that one of the problems faced in trying to forward plan the statistics was the unusual increase in traffic growth of about 3 per cent. I take it that was per annum?

Dr JOB: Yes.

The Hon. ROBERT BROWN (STAYSAFE): David Anderson, the recently retired chief executive of VicRoad, Victoria's counterpart to the Roads and Traffic Authority, said recently in an interview,

"The main priority of roads was to transport freight. Almost everything is transported by trucks."

Road transport is expected to remain the dominant mode of freight movement with at least an additional 50,000 trucks on Australian roads by 2020—and here in New

South Wales we are faced with Port Botany expansion—being semitrailers and B-doubles. One in four vehicles on metropolitan roads will be commercial vehicles by 2020 with associated impacts on production costs, road congestion, road safety, the environment and residential amenity." What is the Roads and Traffic Authority doing and planning to do to deal with the massive increase in demand for road freight transport and its consequential effects on the network and overall road safety?

Dr JOB: I will hand over to Mr Bushby in a moment to talk about the Intelligent Access Program [IAP] program, which is one aspect of how we are handling that. There is a lot of truth in what you are saying in terms of this being a concerning issue. It is especially concerning the New South Wales; 80 per cent of the interstate freight in Australia goes through, arrives in, or emanates from New South Wales, so we actually carry more of that freight than any other State. It is certainly a focal point for New South Wales. We are trying to ensure that we have a safer and safer heavy vehicle fleet and New South Wales has a very large program of checking stations, including mobile checking stations and the Safe-T-Cam program, which checks when vehicles are going through so we can look at how we are driving, check to ensure we have safe driving hours, et cetera.

New South Wales actually has, I would argue, the best of those regimes of any State in Australia. In fact, the data reflects support for exactly that claim. Our checking stations, at a study, recorded the number of defects we identify in vehicles as they pass through and we identified that, in fact, New South Wales vehicles had a lower rate of defects than vehicles from other States. I think that data confirms that our program of inspections and requirements is actually delivering a safer set of vehicles than are being delivered from the other States.

The Safe-T-Cam program is a series of cameras over the network, which only exist currently in New South Wales and in South Australia and we collaborate with South Australia in its enforcement program. This program checks a vehicle when it goes through and we can computer match it to where we have identified a vehicle going through another Safe-T-Cam on another occasion and we can pull that driver over. The logbook said that they stopped for six hours but our Safe-T-Cam records indicate that they did not and there are infringements that can flow from that. That kind of enforcement process is helping us to deliver a safer approach.

In addition, we have introduced what is called the chain of responsibility legislation and the speed deeming legislation. The thrust of both of these pieces of legislation is to remove the onus for safe driving behaviour away from simply being a matter for the driver. It is actually to try and move it into the chain of responsibility of those who are pressuring the driver or pressuring the company or running the company in a manner that forces the driver to drive unsafely or drive unsafe hours or at unsafe speeds to achieve the delivery time frame. These programs allow us to actually examine appropriate records from consigners and lay charges of the operators involved in the total chain of responsibility, rather than just the driver.

The speed deeming legislation—that is a rough term for it but it reflects what it really means—is another program of that form. It is a piece of legislation that allows us to charge the operator of the vehicle for having a vehicle that is automatically deemed by

law now to not be appropriately speed limited if the vehicle is caught on our roads doing a speed of 115 kilometres an hour or more on a piece of road where you could not explain that by virtue of the slope of the road. If a driver is caught on a downhill piece of sloped road the driver can still be charged with a speeding offence, but if he is caught on a flat piece of road doing that speed then it means that the vehicle is not appropriately speed limited. We now have legislation that means that once a vehicle is caught at that speed on an appropriate piece of road it is deemed automatically by virtue of that offence to be not appropriately speed limited. The offence then flows to the operator of the vehicle in addition to the driving offence. We are trying to push the responsibility for the total safety of the program further into the chain of the industry, not just rest with the drivers who are under numerous other commercial pressures to drive in certain ways. We are also introducing the Intelligent Access Program, which Mr Bushby can outline.

Mr BUSHBY: A lot of what Dr Job talked about are the safety protections we have put in place as we go forward with the heavy vehicle industry. It is important to recognise that there needs to be a balance between the economic benefits of the freight industry but not making safety of the road use any worse. Dr Job has talked about the safety aspects and what we have been doing to try to minimise any potential road safety concerns that would come out of that growth in traffic. It is worth mentioning a few other issues in terms of the economic benefits and how we might go about managing that increasing freight that you have spoken to.

There are several things that have been considered or are currently being considered in how the freight will get managed, and the sorts of things that have been in the media recently are the higher mass limits on certain vehicles. That is being progressed around the country. In New South Wales we have been fairly slow in rolling that out for several reasons but mainly because of road safety concerns and infrastructure capacity. We wanted to be sure that before we accept a higher mass on vehicles the roads that they would operate on would be capable of carrying those loads but also that the roads that those vehicles went on were only the roads that were approved and the safety aspects that go along with that, as well as the infrastructure protection.

From an infrastructure protection perspective, we did not want to have vehicles breaking bridges or breaking up pavements. Similarly, we do not want those vehicles on narrower roads or roads that are not capable of carrying the increased traffic. The program that Dr Job referred to is called the Intelligent Access Program. This is a form of monitoring of the location of heavy vehicles and being able to tell what route they have used in transporting their goods. The advantage to the jurisdictions—and this is being adopted around the country—is that it allows us to set conditions on the access of a particular vehicle, a combination or even a particular delivery to a known location and then be able to monitor compliance with those conditions of the permit. This is done through a company that is being set up by all of the jurisdictions called Transport Certification Australia.

They certify third party providers who are in the telematics industry so they are dealing with global positioning system [GPS] and telecommunications with vehicles already and they will have devices in the trucks which allow them to report when the vehicle goes off route. That is important to us in being able to plan for the future freight tasks

on the road network. It allows us to match the vehicles that will be using the road network of the locations that they need to be going with a high level of assurance that there will be compliance of those route conditions. So we have a roll out that would be occurring early next year, and it will be applied to the vehicles that have high mass limits at the moment that are being rolled out as part of our obligations under the AusLink agreement.

STAYSAFE continued to discuss issues associated with increases in road freight transport.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Just getting back to the 50,000 extra trucks on the road by 2020, has any thought being given to the fact that in many cities around the world they have a rule that heavy vehicles cannot use the roads in peak hours or cannot come within a certain radius of the city? Have you given those any thought it all? If you look at the M2, the M3, the M4, any major road today, it is full at peak hour so if we are trying to get another—if you say 80 per cent are in New South Wales—40,000 heavy vehicles in New South Wales on the roads that we have at the moment, that is near impossible. So have you given any thought to sharing the roads in a different category in a different fashion?

Mr BUSHBY: That is part of the urban congestion issue. The use of heavy vehicles within the Sydney area is a State issue, but discussion has been occurring under the COAG agenda over the past six or seven months relating to urban congestion and how to address those issues. Certainly, urban freight is one of the issues that is being addressed in that context. It is being looked at at the national level because it affects not just Sydney and New South Wales; it affects other jurisdictions as well so it is being looked at in that context.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): But if the 80 per cent are going to be in New South Wales you are talking about New South Wales bearing the biggest burden for that increased number of heavy vehicles by 2020.

Mr BUSHBY: The 80 per cent figure relates to the amount of freight that is travelling around the country that has an origin or a destination or passes through New South Wales so it does not mean that 80 per cent of the vehicles would be in New South Wales.

Dr JOB: Part of the way in which New South Wales is trying to handle this issue is by providing effective alternatives which encourage vehicles to take other routes. I think the M7 Motorway is a classic example of providing an effective alternative, which means that heavy vehicles passing through do not have to go through the central roads of Sydney.

Can there be monitoring of truck speeds under the Intelligent Access Program

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Does that include monitoring the speed of those vehicles as well? If not, why not?

Mr BUSHBY: No, it does not. It is actually route compliance at this stage. The speed issue has not been put forward at the national level. In fact, there is some resistance to speed monitoring. The technology is probably capable of doing it, but it has not been put forward and is not part of the legislation that is before the Parliament at the moment.

Auslink

The Hon. ROBERT BROWN (STAYSAFE): You mentioned the AusLink program. What is the overall impact on our road safety effort in New South Wales of the AusLink program?

Dr JOB: The AusLink program as it is now versus the previous model for funding from the Federal Government involves a number of changes. First, all of the funding for land transport is now drawn from a single pool, meaning that nationally important roads compete with rail and other transport modes for those Federal funds. The Commonwealth is no longer accepting responsibility for funding 100 per cent of the works on the former national highways so it is now the case that New South Wales must contribute to maintaining those highways. The Commonwealth funding for maintenance of the former national roads has also been reduced, and also there was a program called the Safety and Urgent Minor Works Program. That program no longer exists under AusLink.

The program does allow that you can spend a certain proportion of the maintenance budget on safety and urgent minor works. That means you have already had a reduced maintenance budget and from that you need to take the safety works in addition. So the effective reduction in funding is even larger than it would appear to be just from the reduction in the maintenance program. It is worth noting that all of that, however, is in addition to the black spots program. The Federal Government also funds a black spots program. We have a State black spots program, where the New South Wales Government funds black spots or safety treatments, and the Federal Government program. The Federal Government's black spots program cannot be spent on those national roads; it is designed specifically for other roads.

Later, Mr Weilinga noted:

Mr WIELINGA: Another thing worth noting is that the strategy at the highest level needs to be correct as well. There is a lot of good co-operation between the States and the Federal Government in developing corridor strategies to handle freight. That takes a whole-of-transport view of not only road but also the movement of freight by rail and a lot of good work is being done on that at the moment.

Speed cameras

Mr BARR (STAYSAFE): There was a report on today's radio that there has been a \$20 million decline in revenue from speed cameras, and different interpretations have been placed on that. One by an NRMA spokesman was that motorists are becoming more canny in terms of locality. What does your research show about speed cameras? Is there generalised benefit or is it location specific or what?

Dr JOB: I think it would be reasonable to say that we need to distinguish mobile cameras because New South Wales also operates fixed cameras. The research you are referring to is about the Fixed Digital Speed Camera Program. We have comprehensive data on that program. We actually have an independent review and study done of the first 28 of those cameras introduced. That review showed a 90 per cent reduction in fatalities at the locations of the cameras and a 20 per cent reduction in injuries. So I think the data resplendently reflects the value that we get from the fixed digital speed cameras. The way this is being promoted in terms of the different views you have alluded to in the media does not take account of the specific way in which New South Wales has used the fixed digital speed camera program.

We explicitly use them as a treatment of a length of road. A length of road is only eligible for a speed camera if it meets two criteria. One is a certain rate of crashes and the other is that a certain rate of vehicles speeding through there so we know it is a site with a crash problem and we know it is a site where people are speeding. Sometimes the most effective way to deal with that is to put in a fixed digital speed camera. That program is on the road designed explicitly in that way in that every single fixed digital speed camera in New South Wales has three signs in all the approach directions to tell you that you are coming to a speed camera location. So it is actually used to treat that location. We have found those profound reductions in crashes and especially severe crashes in those locations.

The fact that we have a reduction in revenue reflects two things. First, the fine for low-level speeding has dropped from \$130 to \$75. That government policy was not because it reflected that speed is a trivial issue but because it wanted to reflect that it was not revenue raising that was the focus. The other part which unfortunately did not receive as much media attention was that we actually increased the demerit points from two demerit points to three demerit points for the same offence. We aimed to produce an effect where we were still getting effective deterrents by virtue of increasing the demerit points but as a show of good faith to the community to reflect that this was not about revenue raising; it was about safety. I think the fact that we have reduced revenue at the cameras means partly that we reduced the fine and partly that people are speeding through these locations less. That is great.

That means that in the sites where we know it is dangerous to speed by virtue of the crash statistics, by virtue of the camera, evaluation is showing that it is giving us the benefit. If we catch no-one at these cameras that is ideal. I do not think we should be saying that if we are getting reduced revenue the cameras are not working. I think the complete opposite; if we are getting reduced revenue the cameras are working, people

are complying with the speed limit and not being fined, and we are gaining a great deal of safety benefit from that compliance.

Mr BARR (STAYSAFE): Is there a generalised benefit though or is it location specific?

Dr JOB: I believe that the fixed digital speed cameras do not show us a substantial generalised benefit. A generalised benefit from speed management I think comes from the police actions, which there can be numerous ways of enforcing a speed limit by virtue of following the vehicle, by virtue of the use of Lydar and radar and by virtue of the use of mobile speed cameras. The police also operate a mobile speed camera program and that program is the one giving us the more general deterrence across the road network. The fixed digital speed camera is not aiming to do that.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): And also, visible policing, we believe that that is probably the greatest deterrent of the lot.

Dr JOB: I agree. It is the visibility of the policing and it is the fact that we are also out there in the media promoting the fact that you can and are likely to be caught for speeding.

Seat belts and truck drivers

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): I think Mr Wielinga made some comments in his opening remarks about the question of truck driving—perhaps you may wish to take this on notice—and he made reference to the fact that the wearing of seat belts by truck drivers had improved from, I think it was, the high 30 per cents to the low or medium 40 per cents.

Mr WIELINGA: Thirty-nine to 48.

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): I was interested in the methodology of determining this. Perhaps you might be able to give the Committee the methodology of assessing such an intricate percentage of truck drivers wearing seat belts?

Dr JOB: I could address that. The study that was referred to was actually a study where we did a program of very localised media to try and get to truck drivers. So the way we do that is: you do not want to spend large dollars going out to television when only a small proportion of your audience is truck drivers, so you tend to target where the truckies stop, and things like that, and through the companies. I think that is a very effective use of the public resource. The way in which we evaluated it was to actually do surveys with truck drivers and we asked them about their awareness of the program to try and find out what aspects of it were most effective and we asked them about their seat belt wearing. So that data comes from those surveys.

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): Is there any way you could provide us with those surveys?

Dr JOB: We could provide you with the data from them. We will see what we can get you in the way of detail from those surveys.

Mopeds and electric motorcycles

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Could I turn to the issue of what I think is loosely called motorised pedal cycles? What is the law regarding what can and cannot be used in terms of motorised pedal cycles?

Dr JOB: Just about any of these devices can be made illegal. The critical factor is which ones require registration and therefore a registration sticker and therefore also a licence to ride the motorcycle.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Let us talk about the threshold for being registrable and licensable.

Dr JOB: The law as stated at the moment says that in order to be registered it must have pedals and it can be assisted by virtue of a motor. That motor cannot produce more than 200 watts of power. That is the current legislation.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): So if a motorised pedal cycle is being used on the road and it has less than 200 watts and has pedals on it, then the police should not be charging or booking those people that are operating them?

Dr JOB: It may seem like a subtle wording difference but there is actually a wording difference between what I said and what you said. The critical thing here is the word "assistance". I think what the police would argue is, is this really a pedal cycle being assisted with a motor or is it a motorcycle masquerading in that way by virtue of a couple of pedals sticking out the sides of what is actually a motorcycle? I think it is a matter of interpretation of the word "assistance".

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): I am not quite following you though. Let me read what clause 15 of the regulations says. It says, "The registration provisions do not apply to any registrable vehicle, comprising a pedal cycle to which is attached one or more auxiliary propulsion motors having a combined maximum power not exceeding 200 watts". It does not use the word "assistance".

Dr JOB: That is the way the police interpret what is written there. That is, what is written there says it is a pedal cycle to which is attached a motor. They would argue that is different from a motorbike to which are attached pedals. In other words, it is a matter of do you have a vehicle which really looks like a normal pushbike with your normal spoked wheels on it and you have put a little motor on it, or does it look like a motorbike and you have put pedals on it?

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): So that is the issue: whether or not it looks like a motorbike?

Dr JOB: You are asking me to interpret for you why the police are issuing infringements, as we both know they are, for certain vehicles, and I am only offering to you my understanding of their interpretation of that clause.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): What they look like is the cause of the problem. You have probably seen these things.

Dr JOB: Yes, I have.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): The specification sheet says that they have a 200-watt motor, but a test by the University of Newcastle revealed that these things have a power output of 132 watts, which is a lot less than 200 watts. I think you would agree that if you started to go up an incline with a motor producing 130 watts, depending on your body weight, it would very quickly stop because it does not have enough power to drive you up the hill.

Dr JOB: I agree. These are questions that you would have to address to the police who are making the interpretation.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Do you see a problem with the way the regulations are written? I cannot understand why the police would book people riding these vehicles when the law clearly says not exceeding 200 watts, and they do not.

Dr JOB: As I said, I do not think it is a dispute over whether it is 200 watts. It is a dispute over whether it is a bicycle to which you have added power assistance or whether it is a motorbike to which you have added pedals to get around the law.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Do you mean ornamental pedals?

Dr JOB: I mean pedals that could be used, but never would be used because the thing operates like a motorbike.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Assume I am sitting on this instrument, 200 watts would not get me too far. I would need to pedal.

Dr JOB: If you were not going uphill you may not need to pedal.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Of course I would be going uphill. There would be a certain gradient at all times.

Dr JOB: Presumably it would be as much downhill as uphill.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Yes, but a slight gradient would require me to pedal.

Dr JOB: I have not ridden one of them. These are question you would need to put to the police.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): The police interpret and police the rules, but who creates the 200-watt rule?

Dr JOB: All these laws are set by Parliament.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): Is it in your Act or is it in their Act?

Dr JOB: It is in legislation to do with road transport, which are run by the Roads and Traffic Authority.

The Hon. GEORGE SOURIS (STAYSAFE): We are talking to the right people, are we not?

Mr BUSHBY: The relevant rules are the Australian road rules. This is a national issue. It is not just a New South Wales issue—

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): No, it is not. It is the motor vehicle registration legislation.

Mr BUSHBY: —which is part of consistent legislation across the country, even though it is adapted to our legislation the way you have described it. The important word is "auxiliary" engine. As Mr Job has said, it is a bicycle to which an auxiliary engine has been fitted, meaning that it is an extra that has been added on rather than being part of the base design of essentially what is a motorbike. The wording of the regulation is really about auxiliary. That is where the trouble comes in.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): The bike that is described as an electric mountain bike would be legal, but the bike that is described as an electric commuter vehicle would not be legal, if they are both sold as electric bikes of less than 200 watts.

Mr BUSHBY: It is the wording of the legislation and how that is enforced that would make the difference between the two rather than what I think.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Would legislation or interpretation be the best way to rectify the situation?

Dr JOB: We would need to examine it before we would be able to answer that question.

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Would you take that on board?

Mr BUSHBY: Yes.

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): Perhaps we should identify the vehicles more precisely for the record.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): They are the same brand. One is called an Eazy Rider electric mountain bike and the other one is called an Eazy Rider electric commuter vehicle. What about gophers, which are designed as electric vehicles? They do not have pedals, but you can ride them on the road.

Mr BUSHBY: The regulations covering gophers are the same as pedestrians. They are mobility assistance vehicles, which means that they are considered pedestrians when a person is using them.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): The way that reads, a motorised pedal cycle of less than 200 watts is to be considered a pedal cycle.

Mr BUSHBY: Correct.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Therefore they cannot be registered?

Mr BUSHBY: That is right.

Motorcycle safety

Mr GIBSON (CHAIRMAN): Motorcycle sales are booming. What are we doing to improve the safety of motorcycle riders?

Dr JOB: We worked with the Motorcycle Council and the industry quite closely to produce programs. Over the years we have produced a number of programs for motorcycle safety, in particular the ones that are high profile. For example, we produced Bus Back, we produced one about wearing effective protective gear and we produced one about the blind spot for drivers, because a number of these crashes are caused by drivers. They are not things that those of us who are not motorcyclists will see a lot of, because a lot of them go into motorcycling magazines, et cetera. Right now we have quite a clever one on bus backs and other areas for drivers who see what looks like almost a black poster, but under certain conditions part of it, which outlines a motorcycle, is highly reflective. Suddenly you can see a motorcycle where you could not before. This reflects our data, which indicates that the number of crashes in traffic for motorcyclists because drivers have not looked effectively into the blind spots and have not anticipated the possibility of a motorcyclist.

We also have programs going directly to motorcyclists about their behaviour. One of our focal points, for example, is another area concerning crash rates of motorcyclists on curves on country roads. We have a number of major billboards and education campaign materials reminding motorcyclists to slow down for those curves. We also address motorcycle issues as part of the black spots program, which deals with curves where motorcyclists, as well as other drivers or road users, may come to grief on the

road. One example of that is the use of more effective median separation so that motorcyclists are not concerned as they take a corner of the possibility of the vehicle coming in the other direction being over the centre line. It is more difficult for them to swerve in that lay-down position to avoid that crash. That kind of separation at curves is very valuable for motorcyclists.

The Hon. IAN WEST (STAYSAFE): Is any work being done to educate motorcyclists about blind spots as opposed to black spots when driving a motorcycle to ensure that they do not ride into a blind spot and that, when driving a car, drivers realise where the blind spots are? There appears to be a complete lack of understanding.

Mr BUSHBY: I agree with you. This is a concerning issue. You are exactly right. We have a parallel campaign precisely on that issue. I should have mentioned it. We give one version of the campaign to drivers to identify blind spots and another version of the campaign goes to motorcyclists to remind them what they should look out for, and anticipate that drivers may not have seen them and, therefore, they should prepare for evasive action and ride in a manner that minimises the possibility of their riding in a blind spot.

Road transport law and cyclists

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): Over the last few days the media have reported about cyclists on city roads. When I drive in the city I regularly see cyclists running red lights. It happens all the time. What is being done to try to bring them into line and make them obey the road rules the same as drivers of every other vehicle?

Mr BUSHBY: From a road safety point of view, cyclists are a bit of a success story. If I compare the data over the last two years we can identify that the number of fatalities involving pedal cyclists has gone down, it is trending down rather than up. However, you are right in identifying that, of course, a number of them behave in a manner that is illegal. That is an enforcement issue for police. My understanding is that police find that more difficult to enforce because they are difficult to catch. If police are in a police patrol vehicle and one shoots past and takes a left turn, the vehicle cannot follow. There are issues for police in terms of enforcement. From our point of view, of course, we have a number of deaths and that is concerning, but the number of deaths is reducing.

Road transport law and pedestrians

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYSAFE): The same applies to pedestrians. Invariably, as the light turns green someone will step off the footpath and run across in front of the traffic that is beginning to move. Are there any programs in place relating to awareness, or police watching pedestrian crossings in an attempt to curb that activity? I see that as extremely dangerous, too.

Dr JOB: Clearly, it is a dangerous piece of behaviour but enforcement in that regard is an issue for the police.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS (STAYS SAFE): If a car were to hit pedestrian after the lights had turned green, who would be at fault? Who would be charged?

Dr JOB: That is a matter for police. The law states that a driver needs to avoid collision with a pedestrian wherever possible, but how the police interpret whether or not, on any given occasion, it was possible to do that is a matter for police. We do, however, address pedestrian issues significantly within the Roads and Traffic Authority. We do not conduct enforcement processes but part of the value of the urban 50 km/h program is the value to pedestrians. In addition to that program, we have a program of specific works. We fund works to produce what we call self-enforcing 40 km/h pedestrian zones, where traffic-calming measures are put in place so that 40 km/h feels appropriate to the motorist.

The Hon. RICK COLLESS: This problem does not apply only to 40 km/h zones; you can see it here in Macquarie Street on the pedestrian crossing at the top end of Martin Place. You only have to watch for five minutes on any given day and you will see them doing it.

Dr JOB: I agree. It is a matter for police. We have reduced the speed limit and that certainly helps dramatically to prevent death and injury.

Road transport law and the Australian Road Rules

The Australian Road Rules were implemented nationally from December 1999, and were largely based on State and Territory law; nevertheless, some changes to previous practices had to be accepted by all Governments. The Australian Road Rules resulted in the elimination of the vast majority of previous differences, leaving only a small number that provide for local variations. As part of the maintenance strategy, these variations will be reduced as practices in jurisdictions become more uniform. The consideration of these amendments forms an integral part of the maintenance strategy, assuring operable and consistent model legislation.

The principles of safety, traffic efficiency, stability and reduced administration cost on which the Australian Road Rules were based, have been taken into account during contemplation of the proposed amendments. No significant adverse impact from adoption of the amendments has been identified during the review process undertaken by the Australian Road Rules Maintenance Group.

Developing useable rules means that they will be easier for all road users to understand, resulting in the reinforcement of the desired on-road behaviour. Individual jurisdictions will determine the extent to which particular changes will need to be publicised and revisions made to information materials and relevant publications. The costs of doing so are considered to be significantly outweighed by the benefits of precise and contemporary law.

The implementation of the Australian Road Rules was reviewed by Rozen in 2003, who reported:

This report examines whether the legislation that implements the Australian Road Rules in Australian State and Territory is uniform or consistent with the Australian Road Rules. The Australian Road Rules were developed by the Commission and were approved by the Australian Transport Ministers in 1999. The principal finding of the report is that all jurisdictions have either adopted the Australian Road Rules without modification or have adopted them with only minor changes.

The Australian Road Rules were intended to be an agreed set of road rules which would be given legal effect by the legislatures of the various States and Territories. In addition to setting out the rules of the road which were intended to be implemented in each Australian jurisdiction, the Australian Road Rules also left a number of matters to be determined by each State and Territory as they saw fit. These are referred to in the report as the “law of the jurisdiction” provisions. In the main, the Australian jurisdictions have either adopted the Australian Road Rules without modification or have adopted them with only minor changes, but all jurisdictions have passed some laws giving effect to the “law of the jurisdiction” provisions.

In 1999, when the Australian Transport Council approved the Australian Road Rules, it also agreed to a maintenance strategy for the Rules to keep them up-to-date and to maintain uniformity and consistency.

In New South Wales, the regulation of road transport generally is the subject of the Road Transport (Safety and Management) Act 1999 (NSW). The Act provides for regulations to be made, and Section 71(3) provides that any such regulations may incorporate apply or adopt publications of the National Transport Commission that have been approved by the Australian Transport Council. The detailed regulation of road transport in New South Wales is effected by the Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) (Road Rules) Regulation 1999 (NSW). That regulation commenced on 1 December 1999. Clause 6 of the regulation provides for the Australian Road Rules are to be read with, and as if they formed part of, this Regulation, while Clause 5 defines “Australian Road Rules” to mean the road rules approved by the Australian Transport Council on 29 January 1999 together with the amendments approved on 30 June 1999 and 11 October 1999. Thus, in New South Wales, the Australian Road Rules have been incorporated into the law of the jurisdiction by reference. STAYSAFE is aware of some difficulties arising from this approach, and from time to time has obtained briefings on issues arising from the process of adopting the Australian Road Rules 'by reference'. After more than six years of operation with this legislative regime, however, there do not appear to be any significant matters arising, although concern continues to be expressed that the regime is cumbersome and confusing.

WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED IN PUBLIC HEARINGS BEFORE THE STAYSAFE COMMITTEE FOR THE INQUIRY INTO ROAD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION AND MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE ROAD SAFETY 2010 STRATEGY

Monday 18 September 2006

Mr Les Wielinga, Roads and Traffic Authority
Mr Michael Bushby, Roads and Traffic Authority
Dr Soames Job, Roads and Traffic Authority
Mr Jim Glasson, Ministry of Transport
Mr Roy Wakelin-King, Ministry of Transport
Mr Robert Randall, Department of Education and Training
Mr Paul Doorn, Department of Education and Training
Ms Beryl Jamison, Department of Education and Training
Ms Pam Albany, New South Wales Health

Monday 25 September 2006

Kathy Hayes, Motor Accidents Authority Of New South Wales
Gillian Browne, Motor Accidents Authority Of New South Wales
Ronald Dorrrough, Acting Commander of Traffic Policy, Traffic Service Branch, New South Wales Police
John Hartley, Commander, Traffic Service Branch, New South Wales Police
Leslie Blake, WorkCover Authority
Jennifer Thomas, WorkCover Authority
Craig Lamberton, Department Of Environment And Conservation
Alan Ritchie, Department Of Environment And Conservation
Geoffrey Mellor, Manager, Department Of Environment And Conservation
Ernest Schmatt, Judicial Commission Of New South Wales
Hugh Donnelly, Judicial Commission Of New South Wales
Laura Wells, Criminal Law Review Division, New South Wales Attorney General's Department
Jacqueline Fitzgerald, Deputy Director, Bureau Of Crime Statistics And Research

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY THE STAYSAFE COMMITTEE FOR THE INQUIRY INTO ROAD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION AND MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE ROAD SAFETY 2010 STRATEGY

- MTR 001 Hon. John Della Bosca MLC, Special Minister of State, Level 30, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety activities by the Motor Accidents Authority over the period 2000-2005.
- MTR 002 Hon. John Watkins MP, Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Level 30, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 003 Hon. Eric Roozendaal MLC, Minister for Roads, Level 30, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 004 Hon. Carmel Tebbutt MP, Minister for Education and Training, Level 33, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 005 Mr Matt Monahan, Office of the Director-General, NSW Health, Locked Mail Bag 961, NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 006 Mr Brendan Stone, Criminal Law Review Division, NSW Attorney General's Department, GO Box 6, SYDNEY NSW 2001, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 007 Hon. Carl Scully MP, Minister for Police, Level 36, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY 2000, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 008 Hon. Bob Debus MP, Minister for the Environment, Level 36, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety situation in New South Wales over 2000-2005.
- MTR 009 Hon. John Della Bosca MLC, Special Minister of State, Level 30, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, SYDNEY NSW 2000, regarding road safety activities by the WorkCover Authority over the period 2000-2005.

Appendix A –

Extracts from the minutes of the STAYSAFE Committee regarding the inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the Road Safety 2010 strategy

This appendix contains relevant extracts from the minutes of STAYSAFE Committee meetings of:

- Friday 15 December 2006

regarding the inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the Road Safety 2010 strategy.

STAYSAFE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON ROAD SAFETY

11:30 A.M., FRIDAY 15 DECEMBER 2006
AT PARLIAMENT HOUSE, SYDNEY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Legislative Council

Mr West
Mr Colless

Legislative Assembly

Mr Gibson
Mr Maguire
Mr Barr

Also in attendance: Mr Faulks, Manager of the Committee, Ms Jay, Senior Committee Officer, and Ms Yeoh, Assistant Committee Officer

The Chairman presiding.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Mr Souris, Mr Bartlett, Mr Hunter, Ms Hay and Mr Brown.

2. Previous minutes

On the motion of Mr Colless, seconded Mr Barr, the minutes of Meeting No. 52 held on Monday 13 November 2006 was accepted as a true and accurate record.

.....

14. Consideration of Chairman's draft report: 'Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010

strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005'

The Chairman presented the draft report: 'Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005'.

The draft report was accepted as being read.

The Committee proceeded to deliberate on the draft report:

Chapter 1

Paras. 1.1 – 1.12: read and agreed to

Chapter 2: read and agreed to

Appendix 1-2: read and agreed to

On the motion of Mr Barr, seconded Mr West:

That the draft report: 'Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005' be read and agreed to.

Passed unanimously.

On the motion of Mr Barr, seconded Mr West:

That the draft report: 'Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005' be accepted as a report of the STAYSAFE Committee, and that it be signed by the Chairman and presented to the House.

Passed unanimously.

On the motion of Mr Barr, seconded Mr West:

That the Chairman and Committee Manager be permitted to correct any stylistic, typographical and grammatical errors in the report.

Passed unanimously.

....

17. General business

.....

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m..

Chairman

Committee Manager

Appendix B—

Reports of the STAYSAFE Committee 1982-2006

STAYSAFE 1 (1982)	Alcohol, drugs and road safety.
STAYSAFE 2 (1984)	Car driver licensing and road safety.
STAYSAFE 3 (1984)	Motorcycling safety.
STAYSAFE 4 (1985)	Is there a police quota system?
STAYSAFE 5 (1985)	Traffic law enforcement.
STAYSAFE 6 (1985)	The administration of random breath testing.
STAYSAFE 7 (1986)	Police hot pursuits.
STAYSAFE 8 (1986)	Speed control.
STAYSAFE 9 (1986)	Safe speed and overtaking on 100 km/h roads.
STAYSAFE 10 (1986)	Radar detectors and jammers.
STAYSAFE 11 (1987)	Safety of 2-lane country roads.
STAYSAFE 12 (1988)	Bicycle safety.
STAYSAFE 13 (1989)	Immediate and certain loss of licence for extreme drink-driving.
STAYSAFE 14 (1989)	Malpractice in driver licence testing.
STAYSAFE 15 (1989)	Alert drivers, and safe speeds for heavy vehicles.
STAYSAFE 16 (1990)	B-Doubles.
STAYSAFE 17 (1990)	Novice drivers: the student's view.
STAYSAFE 18 (1990)	Steering novice drivers towards safety.
STAYSAFE 19 (1992)	Alcohol and other drugs on New South Wales roads. I. The problem and countermeasures.
STAYSAFE 20 (1993)	Alcohol and other drugs on New South Wales roads. II. Offences, penalties, and the management of convicted drivers.
STAYSAFE 21 (1992)	Culpable driving.
STAYSAFE 22 (1992)	Towing caravans and trailers safely.
STAYSAFE 23 (1992)	A decade of the STAYSAFE Committee 1982-1992.
STAYSAFE 24 (1992)	Livestock warning signs: Road safety implications of the draft Rural Lands Protection (Amendment) Bill 1992.
STAYSAFE 25 (1994)	Death and serious injury on New South Wales roads: An examination of the provisions of the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW) regarding dangerous driving.
STAYSAFE 26 (1994)	Pedestrian safety. I. School children around buses.
STAYSAFE 27 (1994)	Traffic stops, police chases and police pursuits of motor vehicles.
STAYSAFE 28 (1995)	Sleep disorders, driver fatigue and safe driving.
STAYSAFE 29 (1995)	Pedestrian safety. II. Cleaning windscreens and other itinerant commercial activities on or alongside the roadway.
STAYSAFE 30 (1996)	Pedestrian safety. III. Bicycle courier activities in the Sydney central business district.
STAYSAFE 31 (1996)	Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1994.
STAYSAFE 32 (1996)	Aspects of road safety administration in New South Wales.
STAYSAFE 33 (1996)	Responses to recommendations in STAYSAFE reports of the 50th Parliament.
STAYSAFE 34 (1996)	A 50 km/h general urban speed limit for New South Wales.
STAYSAFE 35 (1997)	The Traffic Amendment (Street and Illegal Drag Racing) Act 1996 - A report into the sunset provision.

- STAYSAFE 36 (1997) Drivers as workers, vehicles as workplaces: Issues in fleet management.
- STAYSAFE 37 (1997) Driver licensing in New South Wales: First entry into the driver licensing system.
- STAYSAFE 38 (1997) Report of the 2nd meeting of Australasian Parliamentary road safety committees and Ministerial nominees, Parliament House, Sydney, Wednesday 2 April 1997 and Thursday 3 April 1997.
- STAYSAFE 39 (1997) Young drivers - Proceedings of a seminar at Parliament House, Sydney, 30 April 1997.
- STAYSAFE 40 (1997) A 50 km/h general urban speed limit for New South Wales: Progress report and edited minutes of evidence.
- STAYSAFE 41 (1998) Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1995.
- STAYSAFE 42 (1998) Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1996.
- STAYSAFE 43 (1998) Electronic drivers licences.
- STAYSAFE 44 (1998) Developing safer motor vehicles for Australia.
- STAYSAFE 45 (1998) Injury prevention and infection control in the taking of blood samples from drivers suspected of alcohol or other drug impairment.
- STAYSAFE 46 (1998) Falling asleep at the wheel C Legal and licensing implications of driver fatigue.
- STAYSAFE 47 (1998) Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1997.
- STAYSAFE 48 (1998). Pedestrian safety. IV. Child pedestrian safety in New South Wales.
- STAYSAFE 49 (1998). Comments concerning the development of uniform traffic law in Australia—the Australian Road Rules.
- STAYSAFE 50 (2000). Speech by Grant McBride MP, STAYSAFE Chairman, in opening the 4th Local Government Road Safety Conference, Millennium Hotel, Kings Cross, 11-13 August 1999.
- STAYSAFE 51 (2000) Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1998.
- STAYSAFE 52 (2001) Responses of Government agencies to recommendations in STAYSAFE reports of the 51st Parliament.
- STAYSAFE 53 (2001) Traffic control and safety around schools - Part 1 - Major recommendations and summary.
- STAYSAFE 53 (2002) Traffic control and safety around schools - Part 2 -Responses of government agencies to the major recommendations and summary.
- STAYSAFE 53 (2002) Traffic control and safety around schools - Part 3 -The evidence.
 VOLUME 1 – The testimony of school communities in 2000.
 VOLUME 2 – The testimony of school communities in 2001.
 VOLUME 3 – The testimony of representatives of government agencies.
 VOLUME 4 – The testimony of representatives of local councils.
 VOLUME 5 – The testimony of bus and taxi operators, representatives of non-government organisations, private citizens and Members of Parliament.
- STAYSAFE 53 (2002) Traffic control and safety around schools - Part 4 - Summaries of submissions received from government agencies, non-government organisations, and the community.
- STAYSAFE 54 (2002) Road safety and street design in town centres: Towards best practice in traffic control and safety for main streets in New South Wales: Proceedings of a conference held at Parliament House, Sydney, 31 July - 1 August 2000.
- STAYSAFE 55 (2002) Review of the road safety situation in New South Wales in 1999.
- STAYSAFE 56 (2004) Railway level crossings: Improving safety where railways and roads intersect at the same level.

- STAYSAFE 57 (2002) Work-related road safety. Proceedings of a seminar held at Sydney, Thursday 8 February 2002.
- STAYSAFE 58 (2002) Bullying, abuse, intimidation and assault on the road – selected Australasian research on ‘road rage’ and aggressive driving.
- STAYSAFE 59 (2002) On strategic planning for road safety in New South Wales.
- STAYSAFE 60 (2002) A decade of the STAYSAFE Committee, 1992-2002.
- STAYSAFE 61 (2004) Car surfing and the carriage of unrestrained and unprotected passengers on motor vehicles.
- STAYSAFE 62 (2004) “Road safety is no accident”: Proceedings of a seminar for World Health Day, 7 April 2004.
- STAYSAFE 63 (2004) Road crash statistics in 2002
- STAYSAFE 64 (2004) Road crash statistics in 2003
- STAYSAFE 65 (2005) Aspects of motorcycle safety in New South Wales—Proceedings of seminars on issues in motorcycle safety held at Sydney, Friday 3 December 2004 and Tuesday 4 May 2005, and other selected papers.
- STAYSAFE66 (2005) Repairing to a price, not a standard: Motor vehicle smash repairs under the Insurance Australia Group (NRMA Insurance) Preferred Repairer Scheme and its implications for roadworthiness, crashworthiness, and road safety.
- STAYSAFE 67 (2006) Driver distraction: Proceedings of an international conference on distracted driving, Sydney, Australia, 2-3 June 2005
- STAYSAFE 68 (2006) Improving the health of the motor vehicle insurance and smash repair industries: Shifting the focus to public safety—Report of a review of progress in implementing the findings and recommendations of an inquiry into motor vehicle smash repairs under the Insurance Australia Group (NRMA Insurance) Preferred Repairer Scheme
- STAYSAFE 69 (2006) Brief comments on organ and tissue donation
- STAYSAFE 70 (2006) Road safety: From local to global perspectives. Proceedings of the 4th meeting of Australasian Parliamentary road safety committees, together with supplementary papers, Monday 3 April 2006 and Tuesday 4 April 2006, Parliament House, Sydney.
- STAYSAFE 71 (2006) The crash testing of repaired motor vehicles: Further report of an inquiry into motor vehicle smash repairs under the Insurance Australia Group (NRMA Insurance) Preferred Repairer Scheme and its implications for roadworthiness, crashworthiness, and road safety.
- STAYSAFE 72 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Motor Accidents Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 73 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the WorkCover Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 74 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken in the Environment portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 75 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken in the Health portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.

- STAYSAFE 76 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by agencies within the Transport portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 77 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken in the Attorney General's portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 78 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken in the Education and Training portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 79 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken in the Police portfolio to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.
- STAYSAFE 80 (2006) Inquiry into road safety administration and mid-term review of the New South Wales Road Safety 2010 strategy: Report on actions undertaken by the Roads and Traffic Authority to address the road safety situation in New South Wales, 2000-2005.