

include driver warning/information telling motorists why the speed limit was reduced. Initially, only high risk locations should be targeted with harm reduction speed limits. In the above example, a harm reduction solution would be a reduction in speed limit to 50 km/h without any major capital works.

Further research work is required to better understand the role of supporting road features in Safe System implementation. It is particularly important to quantify the number and type of supporting treatments required for equivalence to one primary treatment in minimising deaths and serious injuries. This should be achieved through thorough empirical analysis.

In the medium to long term, a process should be established to assess the infrastructure investments needed to bring the entire network up to the standards where expected levels of mobility can be achieved safely. Restoration of speed limits lowered in the past to be in line with the road class and function should only occur once the road improvements are implemented.

Medium- and long-term strategies should aim at gradual incorporation of Safe System road infrastructure in all areas of the road network, and the harm reduction approach should be abandoned in favour of harm minimisation.

The community expectation of speed limits on different types of roads may alter with time due to congestion management (for example, variable speed limits on freeways). This would reduce the gaps to be bridged through SSA.

Conclusions

Four new principles for setting speed limits in the Safe System context were presented. These principles represent an evolution of the traditional approach for speed limit setting by focussing the consideration on crash severity, crash likelihood and mobility expectations. The new principles recognise that travel should not result in death and serious injury.

It is recommended that the new principles be considered in future speed management policies. At the same time, it is recognised that implementation of speed limits fit for the Safe System will take considerable time and funding commitment. It is thus proposed that an interim harm reduction approach be applied to setting speed limits in the short and medium term.

Notes

- 1 The vision of zero deaths and serious injuries is based on integration of benefits of Safer Roads and Safer Speeds with Safer Vehicles and Safer Road Users. Grave harm due to human error is minimised due to road factors. It may still occur if road users choose not to comply with the road rules, for example.
- 2 In the Safe System context, a primary road feature alone minimises the risk of death and serious injury arising from such a crash. Examples include pedestrian overpass (car/pedestrian crash), roundabout (car/car side impact) or a median barrier (car/car head on). A supporting road feature simply reduces this risk – for example, curve delineation, audio-tactile edge lines or turn lanes. Typically, four to six targeted supporting road features should have a similar effect on a particular crash type as one primary feature.

References

1. Jurewicz, C., Turner, B.: Infrastructure/Speed Limit Relationship in Relation to Road Safety Outcomes, AP-T141/09, Austroads, Sydney.

Local government and road safety

By Cr Geoff Lake, President, Australian Local Government Association

Road trauma is one of the major public health problems facing this country. Last year 1,509 people died on our roads.

The Bureau of Infrastructure Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE) report on the *Cost of Road Crashes in Australia 2006* [1] estimates that road crashes cost the community nearly \$18 billion in 2006, equivalent to 1.7 per cent of GDP. There were an estimated 653 853 road crashes in 2006 involving 1.16 million vehicles resulting in the loss of 1602 lives.

These are shocking statistics, but what they do not reflect is the personal pain and injury experienced by the people directly involved and their families and friends.

The number of deaths on our roads is only part of the problem. The latest hospitalisation figures show that nearly 33,000 people were seriously injured in crashes during 2006-07. Many of these people are now living with severe and life-long injuries. Sadly, these figures have been trending upwards for several years.

Road trauma disproportionately affects young, healthy Australians. About 30% of those killed and 37% of those hospitalised in road crashes are under 25 years old. We have all seen the images in our papers and on our TV screens. The

roadside memorials are a daily reminder. Indeed, it is sobering to think that school children today are unlikely to reach the age of 25 without at least one of their former classmates being killed or seriously injured on our roads.

Much good work has been achieved over the last 40 years to make our roads safer. According to BITRE, annual road deaths have dropped from a peak of 3798 in 1970 to an average of around 1640 between 2000 and 2008, even though the number of vehicles on Australian roads has more than tripled in that time.

Tougher laws and better policing targeting speeding and drink driving, improved driver training, better road design, extensive education campaigns and new vehicle technologies have all contributed to a large reduction in the frequency, severity and economic cost of road crashes over recent decades.

Driver attitudes also need to change. According to the most recent annual survey of Community Attitudes to Road Safety undertaken by the Federal Government [2]:

- 61 per cent of respondents said they use their mobile phone while driving
- 25 per cent consider it acceptable to speed 'if you are driving safely'

- 16 per cent of respondents had fallen asleep at the wheel, with 43 per cent having done so more than once
- 6 per cent of respondents – and 11 per cent of those younger than 25 – 'always, nearly always or mostly' drive at least 10 km/h over the speed limit.

On a more positive note, the same survey found that most people are well-informed about road safety matters and support the efforts of police to catch and punish those who break the law.

Ten years ago State and Federal Transport Ministers, through the Australian Transport Council (on which I represent local government today), agreed on the current National Road Safety Strategy, 2001-2010. The strategy set a target of reducing the rate of road deaths by 40 per cent over that period, from 9.3 to 5.6 deaths per 100,000 people. To date we have achieved a 26 per cent reduction, but it is very unlikely that we will meet the 40 per cent target in the final year of the strategy.

One of the major policy challenges that the Australian Transport Council will be grappling with this year is the next National Road Safety Strategy to operate for the period 2011-2020. The new strategy will need to:

- have a national commitment to achieving ambitious reductions in deaths and serious injuries on Australian roads over the next 10 years and beyond
- present high-level goals and specific policy objectives in areas such as acceptable road speeds, road infrastructure, vehicle safety, road user behaviour and institutional management
- identify agreed actions, timelines, responsibilities and performance indicators.

Role of local government

The BITRE reports do not show what proportion of crashes and deaths occur on local roads controlled by councils. However, we can be certain it is a significant number, as councils are collectively responsible for over 650,000 kilometres or 80 per cent of all roads in Australia. In most cases, it is local roads where there will be the greatest interaction between vehicles and pedestrians.

Roads are local government's biggest asset by some margin. Nationally, local government spends about 25 per cent of its funds on roads, although in rural councils this figure is typically more than 50 per cent. This means that the maintenance of the local road system is one of local government's major tasks, and in the case of almost every council, the largest single item of annual expenditure.

Safety is a key consideration in the design, building and maintenance of roads and is a key factor in prioritising works. Local government also has a major role in the delivery of the Federal Government's Road Safety Black Spot Program, which targets locations that have identified poor road safety history.

One of the strengths of local government is its ability to tailor services to local needs. In different councils and different States, local government is tackling road safety in a variety of

different ways, each designed to achieve the best outcomes. I would like to focus on three specific local government initiatives that are helping to respond to the road safety challenge:

- Moreton Bay Road Safety Partnership Project
- Community transport
- RoadWise.

Moreton Bay Road Safety Partnership Project

Morton Bay Regional Council (MBRC) to the north of Brisbane includes road safety in its corporate plan. In 2007 the Council established the Moreton Bay Road Safety Partnership Project (RSPP) with other road safety stakeholders in the region to work collaboratively to establish road safety as a priority and to develop frameworks to reduce road trauma.

The project involved establishing a Steering Committee with representatives from the Council, the Local Government Association of Queensland, the Department of Transport and Main Roads, the Queensland Police Service, Queensland Health and the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia Queensland. The collaborative nature of the Steering Committee has led to a coordinated approach to road crash and asset data collection and management which, along with community feedback, has helped to identify and prioritise hazardous sites for funding.

The Steering Committee has developed a *Road Safety Strategic Plan and Action Plan* for the Moreton Bay Regional Council area, which provides a framework and direction for an integrated approach by Council and other agencies to improve road safety. The *Road Safety Strategic Plan and Action Plan* identifies the priority road safety issues for the Moreton region and describes both behavioural and engineering actions that are likely to mitigate the problem.

Community transport

The provision of community transport by councils, although not primarily a road safety measure, gives the often vulnerable group of disabled and frail and aged members of the community an alternative to driving when they need to access care and services.

Older members of our community face unique road safety challenges, and statistics show that the highest fatality rates after younger drivers are for those aged over 70 years. Offering alternatives to private motor vehicle travel, such as community-run shuttle bus services, provides an opportunity to improve road safety outcomes for older Australians.

As the population ages, the demand for community transport will grow. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics data show that almost 20 per cent of people aged over 60 in Victoria need assistance with transport, a figure that rises to 33 per cent for those aged 80 to 84 and 43 per cent for those aged 85 to 89.

In Victoria, 45 per cent of councils provide transport services for people who are transport disadvantaged. A report prepared by the Victorian Council of Social Service in 2008 examined six community transport services and found that they provided more than 78 000 passenger trips, travelled over 778 000 kilometres and utilised over 13 800 volunteer hours each year. This is the largely hidden, but rapidly emerging, public transportation of the future, and it is being run out of local government.

RoadWise

The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) has developed road safety programs on a State-wide basis to actively engage and involve local government and the community in implementing specific initiatives of Towards zero, the Western Australian road safety strategy [3].

RoadWise Road Safety Committees are the formal structures and extend across 11 regions encompassing metropolitan, regional and remote areas of Western Australia. This network of committees offers an ongoing mechanism for engaging and involving communities in the dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge.

The committees provide a regular forum where road safety is considered and strategies are developed and tailored to address road safety issues at the community level. They represent local partnerships that enable collaboration and coordination with lead agencies.

More than half of the councils in WA have a formal local road safety committee. Action plans have also been developed by most committees to focus on and monitor local safety activity in their area.

One element of the WALGA RoadWise program has been to establish a network of Type 1 Child Car Restraint Fitters to help parents install child car seats correctly.

Conclusion

The deaths on our roads of more than 1,500 people annually is a major economic cost, but of far more pressing concern is the immeasurable personal anguish for the families and friends of those killed.

More can and should be done to improve our roads, vehicles and also our attitudes to road safety. Local government, as owner and manager of more than 80 per cent of the total road system, has a critical role to play in road safety at the local level

Local government must ensure that its roads are built and maintained to a safe standard by working with the community to identify black spots, by providing transport alternatives for the transport disadvantaged and vulnerable where possible, and by playing a part in changing the attitudes of communities to road safety.

Safety on our roads is something that all three levels of government have a direct interest and a serious stake in.

References

1. Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics. Cost of road crashes in Australia 2006 - Report 118. BITRE, 2010.
2. Petroulias, T. Community attitudes to road safety: 2009 survey report. Canberra: Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government, 2009. Available at www.infrastructure.gov.au/roads/safety/publications/2010/community_att_09.aspx
3. Western Australia Office of Road Safety. Towards Zero: Getting there together, Road Safety Strategy 2008-2020. Perth: Office of Road Safety, 2009.

New Zealand's new road safety strategy

By David Eyre, Policy Project Manager, New Zealand Ministry of Transport - Te Manatu Waka

In March this year, Transport Minister Steven Joyce launched a new strategy for reducing the impact of road crashes over the next decade. *Safer journeys: New Zealand's road safety strategy 2010-2020* (available at www.transport.govt.nz/saferjourneys/Pages/default.aspx) proposes significant changes to help improve New Zealand's road safety. These include raising the driving age from 15 to 16, introducing a zero drink drive limit for under 20s, changing the give way rules for turning traffic and reconsidering the adult drink drive limit.

The initiatives in *Safer journeys* are underpinned by a Safe System approach to road safety, which focuses on actions across the entire road system: roads and roadsides, speeds, vehicles and road use. The strategy also aims to address a number of road safety priorities, such as the safety of young drivers and the impact of drugs and alcohol on road safety.

The strategy was developed by the National Road Safety Committee (NRSC). The NRSC is led by the Ministry of Transport and includes the New Zealand Police, the NZ Transport Agency, the Accident Compensation Corporation and Local Government New Zealand.

From the start, public consultation has been a key part of the strategy. We have aimed to strike a balance between feedback received, resources available to implement change, and the evidence and research. This recognises the importance of both research and public support for road safety actions.

Development of *Safer journeys*

Although New Zealand has made significant road safety progress in the last 30 years, since 2002 this progress has slowed and our number of annual road deaths has fluctuated