

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 47

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 59 (22/02/11)

Senator Joyce asked:

Senator JOYCE—I will leave a question on the record then and we will move on. I appreciate, Chair, that you too, as a person who has done a lot of driving, will understand it. We need to know this on the record. I do not know what they call them in Europe. I imagine they call them bullbars there. We certainly call them bullbars or roo bars here. What is the differentiation between the European standard and what is currently the practice in Australia as fitted to a whole range of sedans that are driving our roads and will this European standard have the capacity for which we attach a bullbar—that is, to protect the occupants from the impact with wildlife?

Senator Carr—We will take that on notice and get you a descriptor in technical terms of what the differences are.

Answer:

Reports that the Government was planning to ban bullbars were not correct.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 48

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 60 (22/02/11)

Senator Abetz asked:

Senator ABETZ—There is a 127-page regulation impact statement dealing with the issue of pedestrian safety. Does that document deal with occupant safety?

Mr Hogan—The document is particularly focused on the application of the pedestrian safety standard. There are many Australian design rules which go to the issue of occupant safety. If you are asking whether—

Senator ABETZ—I am asking about this statement. Does it deal with occupant safety?

Mr Hogan—The intent of the document is that there should be no degradation of occupant safety.

Senator ABETZ—That is the intent. Can you take on notice whereabouts in the document that is indicated to us, please?

Mr Hogan—Yes.

Senator ABETZ—Thank you. Can I also ask: does this proposal deal with the issue of winches and driving lights on the front of motor vehicles as well, besides bullbars?

Ms O'Connell—We will take that on notice.

Answer:

The Regulation Impact Statement for Pedestrian Safety has now been withdrawn.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 49

Program: 2.2

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Vehicles carried on TT-Line for July – December 2010

Proof Hansard Page/s: 62 (22/02/11)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Yes, just a couple of quick ones. You provided to Senator Abetz answers to some questions that he asked on my behalf last estimates about vehicle numbers from Tasmania over the last five years, and the latest figures were 2009-10, so I presume they are calendar year numbers. Do you have any figures more up to date than that for the last six months—say, up to the end of December?

Ms Gosling—I would have to take that on notice. I do not have those figures with me, and—

Senator COLBECK—Okay.

Ms Gosling—I am not even sure whether we will be able to get them, but we will certainly try.

Answer:

See Attachment A.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Additional Estimates February 2011
Infrastructure and Transport

49 - Attachment A

Spirit of Tasmanian I & II – Devonport/Melbourne
 Total actual vehicle numbers claimed during July to December 2010
 (Actual figures do not include scheduled bookings claimed in advance.)

Claim No.	Cars	\$	Buses	\$	Motor Cycles	\$	Caravans	\$	Campervan 5m	\$	Campervan 6m	\$	Motorhomes	\$	Push Bikes	\$	Total Vehicles	Total \$
July	10,544	\$1,939,645	4	\$737	109	\$9,963	618	\$226,590	294	\$60,911			332	\$121,764	22	\$559	11923	\$2,360,169
August	8,486	\$1,578,963	11	\$2,023	121	\$11,199	523	\$192,706	241	\$49,439			218	\$80,516	24	\$605	9624	\$1,915,451
September	9,416	\$1,758,837	16	\$2,948	191	\$17,687	823	\$303,362	298	\$61,768			290	\$107,116	11	\$284	11045	\$2,252,002
October	12,073	\$2,261,366	34	\$6,267	886	\$81,864	985	\$365,070	289	\$58,967			359	\$133,282	28	\$726	14654	\$2,907,542
November	10,326	\$1,936,938	38	\$7,029	808	\$74,944	730	\$271,516	317	\$64,752			283	\$105,426	42	\$1,088	12544	\$2,461,693
December	10,293	\$1,932,679	16	\$2,953	715	\$66,177	804	\$299,224	324	\$66,223			381	\$142,022	69	\$1,794	12602	\$2,511,072
Totals	101,260	\$18,942,994	148	\$27,349	5412	\$501,618	7,799	\$2,895,308	3124	\$636,606	0	\$0	2,894	\$1,075,144	533	\$13,818	121,170	\$24,092,837

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 50

Program: 2.2

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Vehicles carried on TT-Line during 2009/10 by month

Proof Hansard Page/s: 62 (22/02/11)

Senator Colbeck asked:

Senator COLBECK—Okay. The other thing that I would be interested in is if I could get some month-on-month trend lines to work out where the peaks and the troughs are in the claims for passenger vehicles under the Bass Strait Passenger Vehicle Equalisation Scheme.

Ms Gosling—I will take it on notice and we will see whether that is possible, I guess.

Senator COLBECK—Okay.

Ms O’Connell—Is it just restricted to passenger vehicles? There are a number of—

Senator COLBECK—The document that you give me, ST04 attachment A, is quite a comprehensive one, and I have to say I am pretty pleased with it.

Ms O’Connell—So it is the same break-up.

Senator COLBECK—If you could break it up based on that, that would really be very helpful. There is a bit of concern at the moment about capacity for passenger vehicles on those vessels, as I think Senator Abetz might have alluded to last time, and I am just trying to get a sense of where that is heading to. I think the effects are probably post the numbers that you have been able to give me. That is why I am trying to get something post June last year.

Ms O’Connell—Okay, June last year.

Senator COLBECK—So I am just trying to get a bit of a sense. But, of course, I recognise that there are seasonal impacts to those numbers as well, so, if I can get some reflection of that, that gives me the capacity to have a bit of a look at what is actually happening in the system. It has dropped from 188,000 vehicles in 2005-06 down to 163,000—this is cars—in 2009-10. There may be a number of reasons for that, but one of the concerns that have been raised is that there is additional freight being placed on the vessels to the extent of about 100 cars per sailing. So I am just trying to get a sense of what the impacts were, and I think those things were instigated during the year last year, so they would not show up in these figures specifically.

Ms O’Connell—Okay.

Answer:

See Attachment A.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Additional Estimates February 2011
Infrastructure and Transport

50 - Attachment A

Claims for the Spirit of Tasmania I & II – Devonport/Melbourne
 Total actual vehicle numbers claimed during the 2009/2010
 (Actual figures do not include scheduled bookings claimed in advance.)

Claim No.	Cars	\$	Buses	\$	Motor Cycles	\$	Caravans	\$	Campervan 5m	\$	Campervan 6m	\$	Motorhomes	\$	Push Bikes	\$	Total Vehicles	Total \$
July	11,396	\$2,059,950	3	\$540	159	\$14,365	550	\$99,204	99	\$17,877	136	\$29,763	244	\$88,140	17	\$425	12,604	\$2,310,264
August	8,615	\$1,567,131	6	\$1,086	134	\$12,149	444	\$80,427	61	\$11,067	98	\$21,610	190	\$68,940	5	\$125	9553	\$1,762,535
September	9,932	\$1,807,584	18	\$3,252	178	\$16,142	827	\$149,619	90	\$16,344	132	\$29,184	244	\$88,584	13	\$325	11,434	\$2,111,034
October	13,346	\$2,437,524	25	\$4,527	917	\$83,148	841	\$153,015	117	\$21,363	161	\$35,902	335	\$122,100	46	\$1,150	15,788	\$2,858,729
November	10,934	\$1,998,531	20	\$3,615	2429	\$219,756	650	\$118,575	137	\$25,038	141	\$31,506	307	\$112,182	41	\$1,025	14659	\$2,510,228
December	10,600	\$1,938,246	16	\$2,892	608	\$55,236	699	\$127,599	118	\$21,570	127	\$28,728	345	\$126,066	89	\$2,225	12602	\$2,302,562
January	25,311	\$4,627,506	20	\$3,648	1165	\$105,909	1,415	\$258,276	158	\$28,884	270	\$63,014	466	\$170,286	115	\$2,875	28920	\$5,260,398
February	18,486	\$3,382,209	9	\$1,635	2,097	\$190,771	1,710	\$312,735	247	\$45,186	340	\$76,124	810	\$296,328	140	\$3,500	23,839	\$4,308,488
March	19,652	\$3,595,755	37	\$6,720	3,328	\$302,767	1,992	\$364,386	243	\$44,457	387	\$86,634	976	\$357,096	88	\$2,200	26,703	\$4,760,015
April	16,644	\$3,045,420	29	\$5,271	960	\$87,359	1,430	\$261,618	152	\$27,801	269	\$61,519	814	\$297,786	43	\$1,075	20,341	\$3,787,849
May	9,440	\$1,673,442	13	\$2,376	229	\$20,020	817	\$292,002	220	\$44,518	0	\$0	344	\$123,630	30	\$750	11,093	\$2,156,738
June	9,592	\$1,755,300	6	\$1,095	180	\$16,380	761	\$278,496	267	\$54,747	0	\$0	308	\$112,710	27	\$675	11,141	\$2,219,403
Totals	163,948	\$29,888,598	202	\$36,657	12384	\$1,124,002	12,136	\$2,495,952	1909	\$358,852	2061	\$463,984	5,383	\$1,963,848	654	\$16,350	198,677	\$36,348,243

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 51

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: National Road Safety Strategy Benchmarking

Proof Hansard Page/s: 63 (22/02/11)

Senator Nash asked:

Senator NASH—Do these come out annually—the NRSS?

Ms O’Connell—The National Road Safety Strategy?

Senator NASH—Yes.

Ms O’Connell—The National Road Safety Strategy is a decade-long strategy. It is the international Road Safety Decade of Action, and most countries are looking at a decade of road safety initiatives. It looks at a systems-based approach, so it is not just one single initiative but looks at—

Senator NASH—At the whole lot.

Ms O’Connell—the whole lot.

Senator NASH—Is there any measurement on the way through of how it is tracking, or do you wait until you get to 2020 before you do that?

Ms O’Connell—No, there is measurement all the way through in terms of—

Senator NASH—Okay. When did it start? Has it only just—

Ms Gosling—The draft strategy has just closed. The submissions have just closed, so it will be considered by the Australian Transport Council in May.

Senator NASH—Can you, if you would not mind—and I am very happy for you to take this on notice— just say what that benchmarking will be over the next 10 years as you are measuring whether or not you are getting towards it or how that is all going to work, thanks...

Answer:

The primary measure of performance proposed in the draft National Road Safety Strategy 2011–2020 (the draft Strategy) is the actual reductions in the annual numbers of fatalities and serious injuries. The draft Strategy proposes that this measure be used to continuously track progress over the decade to 2020.

A range of supplementary performance indicators are also proposed to help assess progress in the various areas targeted by the strategy. A set of specific indicators will be included in the strategy when it is finalised by the Australian Transport Council for release.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 52

Program: 2.2

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Heavy Vehicle Rest Areas

Proof Hansard Page/s: 63-64 (22/02/11)

Senator Nash asked:

Senator NASH—.... I have just one last very quick question on the vehicle rest stops. In answer to some very good questions from Senator Williams on notice, basically about the rest stops and the optimum number, one of the answers says: ‘The audit did not quantify an optimal number of rest areas for this network. The audit did, however, identify that there was a deficiency of rest opportunities on 60 per cent of this network, as well as deficiencies in site facilities at existing rest areas.’ It is STP03. How can you know if there is a deficiency if you do not know what the optimal number of rest stops is?

Ms O’Connell—I think, in terms of rest stops, when Senator Williams was asking some questions earlier, we did cover the process of the rounds for the heavy vehicle safety package 1, and the second round of heavy vehicle safety package—so that process of how the rest stops are prioritised and then selected. I think this is reflecting that the demands for rest stops are clearly high. The more rest stops, I think, the better, in terms of the process that people are allowed to put forward in submissions.

Senator NASH—But you see my point. It is difficult to find out how you can see what is not good enough when you do not know what is good.

Ms O’Connell—I think it is probably fair to reflect that there is not a sort of national standard for number of rest stops.

Senator NASH—I will go back and read the *Hansard*, sorry. I do not think I was in the room when Senator Williams was doing that. Perhaps I might put something on notice. I just find it very difficult to see how you can identify what the deficiency is if you do not actually know what the optimum number of rest stops is. Perhaps you could take that on notice for me anyway and come back with more of a thorough answer, thanks.

Answer:

In 2005, the National Transport Commission (NTC) published the National Guidelines for Provision of Rest Area Facilities (Guidelines). The Guidelines state that:

“Intervals between Rest Areas should depend on the category of rest area selected, the volume and mix of traffic and the demand for parking and rest opportunities identified in the Rest Area Strategy Plan for a given highway or route. However, as a general rule:

- *Major Rest Areas should be located at maximum intervals of 100km.*
- *Minor Rest Areas should be located at maximum intervals of 50km.*
- *Truck Parking Bays should be located at maximum intervals of 30km.”*

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

In 2008, Austroads published an Audit of Rest Areas (Audit) which used the Guidelines to assess rest areas on routes which in total amounted to 12,700 kilometres of roads in Australia.

The Audit assessed whether rest areas on particular routes were consistent with the Guidelines. Key considerations included spacing, design, layout and facility compliance. Failure to meet any of these aspects meant that a route was considered to not be consistent with the Guidelines. The Audit did not quantify an optimal number of rest areas, nor is this figure able to be inferred from the data presented in the Audit.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 53

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 73 (22/02/11)

Senator Joyce asked:

Senator JOYCE—I can think of a number of people who have been killed by reason of not having a bull bar and I want to know—without being trite about it—how many people are we going to compromise and how many people are actually going to die because they have got the wrong bull bar?

Mr Hogan—Senator, there is some work quoted in the regulation impact statement undertaken by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau back in 2000 which showed that this was a very difficult issue to quantify. What the figures in the RIS are about are: if you had the pedestrian safety standard applied to all new vehicles—only new vehicles—from 2013—

Senator JOYCE—We are all going to own one of those new vehicles one day, Mr Hogan.

Mr Hogan—You would achieve savings of 65 lives and 3000 serious injuries averted.

Senator JOYCE—But I can think of one right off the top of my head where, of all things, a sheep got jammed into the steering mechanism and the car flipped. If he had had a bull bar it would not have. The person is dead. The trouble is, I can think of a number who have been killed because they do not have bull bars but I cannot think of one person who has ever been killed by reason of a bull bar.

Mr Hogan—We are not suggesting that people are going to be killed by reason of bull bars, Senator. What we are suggesting is implementation of a standard that makes the front of vehicles friendlier to pedestrians. It therefore makes sense that you do what you reasonably can to ensure—

CHAIR—Mr Hogan, I am sorry to cut you off. We are going around in circles. Senator Joyce, with your blessing, let's not let it go. Can we get the department to agree to take that on notice and come back to us with something, please?

Mr Mrdak—I am happy to try to. We will get some further analysis of those figures.

Answer:

Reports that the Government was planning to ban bullbars were not correct.

The Regulation Impact Statement for Pedestrian Safety has now been withdrawn.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 54

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 73-74 (22/02/11)

Senator Nash asked:

Senator NASH—Within the context of taking that on notice—I think it was the 200 deaths—could you provide for the committee how many of those deaths occurred with a vehicle with a bull bar and how many of those deaths would have occurred with contact with that vehicle anyway even without a bull bar, to determine what can be attributed to a bull bar and what is just attributed to the accident.

Mr Mrdak—I am happy to do that. We will see what the data can tell us.

Senator NASH—I think you touched on this, Mr Mrdak, but can you tell us about any work that has been done on rural road fatalities in vehicles that have not been fitted with a bull bar.

CHAIR—That makes sense.

Mr Mrdak—They are valid points and we will see if the data actually provides that sort of detail.

Answer:

Refer to 53.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 55

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 74 (22/02/11)

Senator Joyce asked:

Senator JOYCE—I hoped to if you did not interrupt. What consultation have you had—this was the end of my question—with the bull bar industry?

Ms Gosling—Senator, the RIS is out for comment now until mid-April. There are quite a number of industry organisations that we have forwarded the RIS directly to and that we are in consultation with. I am happy to go through that list or provide that on notice in terms of quite a range of different industry groups that are being consulted and that will obviously make comment on the RIS.

Answer:

Refer to 53.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 56

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 77 (22/02/11)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Senator O'BRIEN—That is not what the document on your website says. I have it on the screen now. I have just looked it up at 'Summary of proposed requirements for vehicles and VFPS (bull bars)' under the Australian Department of Infrastructure and Transport, Pedestrian Safety. It says 'where VFPS (bull bars) are fitted, the following would apply' and it says to see table 2. There is 'for vehicles not specifically designed for off-road use' and then it goes through a number of those, and you have got the European standard. It says 'for vehicles specifically designed for off-road use, such as four-wheel drive passenger cars, eg Subaru Forester'. Then it goes on through four-wheel drive light commercial vehicles and four-wheel drive sports utility vehicles and says under a 'standard already established in Australia, Australian Standard 4876.1-2002'. So we are getting mixed messages here. As I said, that specifically names the Subaru Forester as a four-wheel drive passenger car which would qualify for the existing Australian standard.

Mr Mrdak—What is on the website is what is with the proposal.

Mr Hogan—I will have to take that on notice, Senator, and clarify that.

Senator O'BRIEN—Sure. I will be interested in that clarification. What is the document you are quoting from?

Mr Hogan—I am quoting from the fact sheet. There is a website for Australian design rules and on that website currently sit the draft regulation impact statement, a little bit of explanatory material and a link through to a fact sheet. I am reading from the fact sheet.

Senator O'BRIEN—Just in case I cannot find it, could you supply that on notice as well?

Mr Hogan—Absolutely.

Mr Mrdak—We will provide those, Senator.

Answer:

Refer to 53.

Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2011

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 57

Program: 2.3

Division/Agency: (STP) Surface Transport Policy

Topic: Pedestrian Safety

Proof Hansard Page/s: 79 (22/02/11)

Senator Nash asked:

Senator NASH—How many vehicles are there with bull bars in Australia?

Mr Hogan—The figure is somewhere in the regulation impact statement, but I would have to take it on notice.

Answer:

Refer to 53.