



MONASH University

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Final Report

RR 10-002

Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre

School of Public Health

Curtin University

Hayman Road

Bentley WA 6102

Peter Palamara; Delia Hendrie; Michelle Fraser; Brett Hughes; Jim Langford
August 2011

**CURTIN-MONASH ACCIDENT RESEARCH CENTRE
DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL INFORMATION**

Report No.	Project No.	Date	Pages	ISBN	Version
RR 10-002	09-001 CON	August 2011	88+	N/A	3.0

Title

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project: Final Report

Author(s)

Palamara, P.; Hendrie, D.; Fraser, M.; Hughes, B.; Langford, J.

Performing Organisation

Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (C-MARC)
School of Public Health
Curtin University
Hayman Road
BENTLEY WA 6102

Tel: (08) 9266-2304

Fax: (08) 9266-2958

www.c-marc.curtin.edu.au

Sponsor

Western Australian Local Government Association
15 Altona Street
WEST PERTH WA 6005

Abstract

This is the second and final report of the Western Australian Local Government Association investigation into the possible role(s) of Local Government in speed enforcement management in Western Australia. The first report by Palamara, Jones, Hildebrand and Langford (2011) documented the methodology and findings of the Phase One project activities. Central to the findings was the identification of three potential options for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management. These models were refined and developed in Phases Two and Three of the project through a range of consultations with Western Australian Local Government, WA Police and other road safety stakeholders. Only one model, a proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police for the supply and use of local area speeding information for strategic enforcement by police, was supported by the agencies consulted. A number of recommendations were provided to progress this model into action.

Keywords

Road safety; Local Government; speed management; speed enforcement

Disclaimer

This report is disseminated in the interest of information exchange. The views expressed here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Curtin University or Monash University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY x-xvi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xvii

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. PHASE TWO 3

 2.1 Specification of three interim models for Local Government participation in the management of speed enforcement..... 3

 2.2 Workshop with Western Australian Local Government representatives to review the proposed interim models..... 5

 2.2.1 Workshop participants and format 5

 2.2.2 Summary of workshop discussions 6

 2.3 Development and economic costing for Model 3 and Model 2..... 11

 2.3.1 Model 3..... 12

 2.3.2 Model 2..... 19

3. PHASE THREE 29

 3.1 On-line survey of Local Government, WA Police, and other local road safety stakeholders 29

 3.1.1 Methodology 29

 3.1.2 Survey findings for Model 3 32

 3.1.3 Survey findings for Model 2 47

 3.1.4 Conclusions from the survey findings..... 67

 3.2 Consultation with WA Police 69

 3.3 Consultation with Local Government representatives..... 71

4. PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN WA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND WA POLICE FOR THE SUPPLY AND USE OF LOCAL AREA SPEED DATA FOR TARGETED ENFORCEMENT 75

 4.1 Introduction..... 75

 4.2 Aim and objectives of the partnership model 77

 4.3 Collection of vehicle travel speed data by Local Government..... 77

 4.4 Potential cost of the collection of vehicle travel speed data 79

 4.5 Processes for the supply of vehicle travel speed data to WA Police 80

 4.6 Processes for the response by WA Police to speed data provided by Local Government82

 4.7 District area meetings to support the partnership program..... 83

 4.8 Internet based resource to support the partnership program..... 84

 4.9 Funding opportunities to support the partnership program activities of the Local Government and WA Police..... 85

5. RECOMMENDATIONS 86

REFERENCES..... 88

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

APPENDIX A

Email invitation to Western Australian Local Government members inviting their participation in the Phase Two workshop

APPENDIX B

Phase Two Workshop background briefing document

APPENDIX C

Email invitation to WA Police, Local Government and other road safety stakeholders to participate in the Phase Three on-line survey

APPENDIX D

Local Government, WA Police and other road safety stakeholder Phase Three on-line surveys

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Classification of Local Government by length of sealed road	14
Table 2.2	Weekly and annual traffic count targets by Local Government classification.	15
Table 2.3	Range and average annual cost of vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification	17
Table 2.4	Annual administrative hours and associated costs for vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification	17
Table 2.5	Assumptions used in developing the cost segment of the local government speed enforcement model	24
Table 2.6	Estimates of the cost of Local Government speed enforcement per enforcement hour, by type of road and size of council	25
Table 2.7	Assumptions used in developing the model of the revenue raised through Local Government speed enforcement	26
Table 2.8	Estimates of the revenue raised from Local Government speed enforcement per enforcement hour	26
Table 2.9	Estimates of the net revenue derived from local government speed enforcement per enforcement hour, by type of road and size of local council.....	27
Table 3.1	Identifiable Local Government and employment position of respondent	32
Table 3.2	The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve the police’s understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement (Local Government respondents)	33
Table 3.3	The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve police’s understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)	33
Table 3.4	WA Police enforcement of vehicle speed on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Local Government respondents).....	33
Table 3.5	WA Police enforcement of vehicle speeds on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	34
Table 3.6	The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy	34
Table 3.7	The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	34
Table 3.8	The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money (Local Government Stakeholders)	35
Table 3.9	The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money (Other Road Safety Stakeholders).....	35

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 3.10	It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement; Local Government respondents (Local Government Stakeholders).....	35
Table 3.11	It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	36
Table 3.12	WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government (Local Government respondents).....	36
Table 3.13	WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	36
Table 3.14	The proposed model generally supports the state strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented (Local Government respondents)	37
Table 3.15	The proposed model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	37
Table 3.16	From the options listed, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program? Select as many as apply (Local Government respondents).....	38
Table 3.17	From the options listed, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	38
Table 3.18	My Local Government already supplies WA Police with enough information about speeding on local area roads to assist with their enforcement activities	40
Table 3.19	Subject to appropriate financing arrangements, my Local Government would be willing to participate in the proposed model to supply local area vehicle traffic speed data to WA Police	40
Table 3.20	Under the proposed model, my Local Government would need to increase the number of vehicle traffic counts it presently conducts each year.....	41
Table 3.21	Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed number of annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?41	
Table 3.22	Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed costs of the annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?42	
Table 3.23	My Local Government has sufficient personnel to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts	43
Table 3.24	My Local Government would look to employ a subcontractor to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts.....	43
Table 3.25	My Local Government does not have the financial resources required to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts	44
Table 3.26	My Local Government would prefer to enter the proposed partnership with WA Police as part of a regional grouping of councils.....	44

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 3.27	My Local Government supports the idea of creating a database for the upload of vehicle traffic speed data for access by WA Police	45
Table 3.28	My Local Government believes local residents would not approve of the council providing police with information about speeding to assist local area enforcement	45
Table 3.29	WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under <i>any</i> circumstance (Local Government respondents)	48
Table 3.30	WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under <i>any</i> circumstance (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).....	48
Table 3.31	Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding <i>only</i> on the local area roads it is directly responsible for (Local Government respondents).....	49
Table 3.32	Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding <i>only</i> on the local area roads it is directly responsible for (Other Road Safety Stakeholders).....	49
Table 3.33	It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police (Local Government respondents)	49
Table 3.34	It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)	50
Table 3.35	If Local Government undertakes camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI TruCam in ‘automatic’ mode and not stop motorists to issue an infringement notice (Local Government respondents).....	50
Table 3.36	If Local Government undertakes camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI Trucam in ‘automatic’ mode and not stop motorists to issue an infringement notice (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)	51
Table 3.37	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Local Government respondents).....	51
Table 3.38	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Other Road Safety Stakeholders).....	51
Table 3.39	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is <i>not</i> a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy (Local Government respondents).....	52
Table 3.40	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is <i>not</i> a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)	52
Table 3.41	The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement (Local Government respondents)	53
Table 3.42	The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents).	53

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 3.43	WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and the issue of infringement notices (Local Government respondents)53
Table 3.44	WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and issue of infringement notices (Other Road Safety respondents) ... 54
Table 3.45	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money (Local Government respondents)..... 54
Table 3.46	The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)54
Table 3.47	If your Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera for use? (Local Government respondents)..... 55
Table 3.48	If Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera to Local Government for use? (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)..... 56
Table 3.49	Who do you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program component)? <i>Select as many as apply</i> (Local Government respondents)..... 56
Table 3.50	Who do you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program)? <i>Select as many as apply</i> (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)..... 57
Table 3.51	If camera based enforcement was outsourced, please indicate your preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service (Local Government respondents)..... 58
Table 3.52	If camera based enforcement was outsourced, please indicate your preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)..... 58
Table 3.53	My Local Government believes that <i>no</i> additional enforcement of speeding is required on its local area roads 61
Table 3.54	My Local Government is opposed to undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police 61
Table 3.55	My Local Government would prefer to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police as part of a regional grouping of Local Governments..... 62
Table 3.56	My Local Government does not support the use of Rangers to conduct the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police 62
Table 3.57	My Local Government does not currently have sufficient employees to work as camera operators to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police..... 63
Table 3.58	My Local Government has sufficient administrative capacity to support the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police 63

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 3.59	My Local Government would need to receive financial compensation to undertake the proposed camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	64
Table 3.60	My Local Government believes that local residents would not approve of us undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	64
Table 3.61	My Local Government believes that it should work with WA Police to jointly determine the weekly schedule of camera enforcement to be conducted by Local Government	65
Table 3.62	My Local Government supports the idea of creating an internet based system for the upload of digital camera images it collects for processing by WA Police	65
Table 3.63	Details of Local Governments interviewed in Phase 3.....	71
Table 4.1	Weekly and annual traffic count targets by Local Government classification.	78
Table 4.2	Range and average annual cost of vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification	79
Table 4.3	Annual administrative hours and associated costs for vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification	80

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This is the second and final report for the four-phase investigation into the potential role(s) for Local Government in the management of speed enforcement in Western Australia. Phase One of the project (see Palamara, Jones, Hildebrand & Langford, 2011) documented the current and potential roles of Local Government in the enforcement of speed limits and the broader relationship between Western Australian Local Government and other speed management and enforcement stakeholders in Western Australia. Three potential roles for Local Government were identified, being:

1. Autonomous and independent speed enforcement by Local Government on local area roads.
2. A partnership between Local Government and police to share camera based enforcement on local area roads.
3. Formalised vehicle speed monitoring by Local Government and sharing of the data with police to assist their targeted enforcement of speeding on local area roads.

The above options were the focus of the Phase Two and Phase Three project activities and finally the Phase Four recommendation of one model for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management. This report documents the activities and findings of these phases and the final recommended model.

Phase Two

The specific objectives of Phase Two were to:

- specify a number of interim models for the involvement of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement;
- obtain feedback from Local Government via a workshop on the acceptance and viability of these interim models; and
- undertake further development, including an economic analysis, of the interim model or models supported by Local Government representatives.

The three possible options for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management identified in Phase One were reviewed by the project team with the aim of

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

specifying their relevant parameters and processes as ‘interim models’. The models, below, were the subject of a workshop with Local Government to obtain feedback on their relative merits and value.

1. The operation of an automated speed camera program by Local Government on local area roads with full deployment and financial control responsibilities and independence of WA Police.
2. The operation of an automated fixed and mobile speed camera program by Local Government under a local area partnership with police and financed by government.
3. The collection of and provision of vehicle travel speed information by Local Government to WA Police to support the strategic deployment of enforcement resources by police on local area roads.

Twenty-four (nine non-urban and 15 urban) of n=139 invited Local Governments participated in the workshop. Overall, the Local Government respondents rejected Model 2 and provided qualified, limited support for Model 2 and good support for Model 3.

In line with the workshop findings Model 2 and Model 3 were the focus of further development, including an economic analysis. This task involved consultation with a number of groups including various Local Governments, state government departments (eg., Main Roads WA, Office of Road Safety), WA Police, commercial vehicle traffic count companies, and Australian agents of speed camera technologies.

Phase Three

The specific objectives of Phase Three were to:

- develop and implement an on-line survey to obtain feedback from WA Local Government representatives, WA Police, and other local road safety stakeholders on the viability and acceptance of Model 2 and Model 3 developed in Phase Two;
- further refine the models in line with the findings of the on-line survey; and
- obtain final feedback from a sample of Local Government representatives on the proposed final model.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Three versions of the on-line survey were constructed, one version for each of Local Government, WA Police and other road safety stakeholders. All three versions contained a set of common statements and questions about Model 2 and Model 3, while the versions distributed to Local Government and WA Police contained additional statements and questions related to their proposed contributions under Model 2 and Model 3.

All n=139 Local Governments were invited to complete the on-line survey, as were WA Police and select personnel from the following local road safety stakeholders:

- the Western Australian Office of Road Safety;
- Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA);
- Royal Automobile Club (WA) (RAC WA);
- Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (WA Branch) (IPWEA), and
- the Australian Institute of Traffic Planning and Management (WA Branch) (AITPM)

Twenty-nine Local Governments (14 urban and 15 non-urban) completed the survey. One ‘corporate’ submission was received from WA Police and eight individual submissions from the group of local road safety stakeholders.

The main findings of the survey for Model 2 were as follows:

- WA Police did not support the outsourcing of a speed camera enforcement program to Local Government, whether for operation on Local Government controlled roads only or all roads.
- Opposition to Model 2 was similarly expressed by 59% and 55% respectively of urban and non-urban Local Government respondents.
- Most of the other road safety stakeholder respondents either supported Model 2 or were at best unsure of its merits.

The main findings of the survey for Model 3 were as follows:

- All three groups of survey respondents expressed a positive view of Model 3, with Local Government and WA Police supporting the idea to form a partnership to respectively supply and receive information on speeding on local area roads.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- There was general agreement that Model 3 would improve police's understanding of the local area roads that required speed enforcement and that enforcement on these roads would reduce local area speeding.
- WA Police did not support the proposal that they should provide enforcement on *all* local area roads identified by Local Government where speed is a problem.
- Many Local Government respondents considered that the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts for Model 3 was unnecessary and excessive and could not be met without financial assistance.
- WA Police considered that they do not have the physical and financial resources required to process and review the speed data supplied by Local Government and to deliver the required additional hours of speed enforcement on identified local area roads.

Upon review of the survey findings the Project Steering Committee recommended:

- Model 2 be rejected; and
- the continued investigation and development of Model 3 through further consultation with WA Police and Local Government representatives.

A number of 'face to face' and telephone interviews were subsequently conducted with various representatives from WA Police in relation to Model 3. The interviews reached 'in principle' agreement on the responsibilities of police and for the processes to support the required activities of police and Local Government under a Model 3 partnership. These outcomes and agreements were the subject of a series of telephone interviews with Local Government (four urban; two non-urban) to obtain their feedback and concerns before finalising the final model in Phase Four.

Phase Four

The final, recommended model for the participation of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement in Western Australia is a partnership with WA Police to supply timely and contemporary information on local area vehicle travel speeds for use by police in the strategic enforcement of speeding (Model 3).

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

The partnership has the capacity to assist with the strategic enforcement of speeding and subsequently reduce local area speeding. These outcomes are fundamental to the state's Speed Enforcement Strategy and the associated development of strategies for best practice in speed enforcement for Western Australia and the State's *Toward Zero* road safety strategy 2008-2020.

The partnership offers a more formalised approach to the sharing and use of local area speed data to replace the ad-hoc arrangement that presently exists between some Local Governments and WA Police. The partnership does not however, obligate either organisation nor does it reflect the final form or all processes of the partnership. The intention of the framework for the partnership is to provide a foundation for further dialogue between Local Government and WA Police.

Aim of the Model 3 partnership

The aim of the partnership is to establish a formalised, sector-wide framework for the collection of contemporary local area roads travel speed data by Local Government and the provision of this information to and use by WA Police to support the strategic enforcement of speeding.

Objectives of the Model 3 partnership

The objectives of the partnership are to:

- improve the quantity and quality of vehicle traffic speed data collected by Local Governments;
- provide guidelines for the supply of local area vehicle speed data by participating Local Governments to WA Police and police's processing of the data;
- provide guidelines for the use of vehicle speed data by WA Police in their speed enforcement activities; and the
- implementation of strategies to aid communication and accountability within the partnership.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Summary of the Model 3 partnership roles, responsibilities, and processes

- Guidelines were developed for the number of weekly vehicle traffic counts to be conducted by Local Government to identify local area roads where speeding is a problem. The weekly number of counts varied between 2.5 and 15 according to the classification of the Local Government.
- Local Government would report to WA Police only those roads where a minimum of 15% of monitored vehicles exceed the posted speed limit.
- Local Government will compile a listing of problem roads using *Microsoft Excel* and forward this by email once a month to their local WA Police District Traffic Intelligence Officer.
- The District Traffic Intelligence Officer will forward those problem roads thought to be suitable for Vitronic speed camera enforcement to the Infringement Management Operations (IMO) office for 'cross checking' against their existing camera deployment locations database to avoid the duplication of location.
- Locations that are subsequently assessed by the IMO as suitable for camera enforcement will be added to the deployment locations database for random selection.
- The District Traffic Intelligence Officer will note those roads deemed unsuitable for Vitronic speed camera enforcement, though WA Police will not guarantee that these roads will be subject to other modes of speed enforcement.
- Local Government will not automatically be updated on the enforcement activity undertaken on identified roads or the outcomes of that enforcement. This will only be provided upon application to WA Police.
- Quarterly meetings will be held between the District Traffic Intelligence Officer and district Local Government representatives to review the partnership processes and outcomes.
- The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) and WA Police will collaborate to develop a website, hosted by WALGA, to provide Local Government with the necessary information and resources to participate in the partnership program.
- Recently announced increases in funding to the Road Trauma Trust Account was identified as a potential source of funding of both the proposed number of vehicle traffic counts and additional hours of police enforcement.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Recommendations to progress the Model 3 partnership

The following recommendations were proposed to progress the suggested partnership between Local Government and WA Police.

1. Present the proposed partnership model to the Western Australian Local Government State Council for consideration.

This process will enable the 17 Local Government zones of the State Council to indicate whether they:

- accept the partnership as proposed and wish the WA Local Government Association to commence negotiations with WA Police;
- accept the partnership ‘in principle’ but with recommended changes; or
- reject the proposed partnership model and the involvement of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

2. Establish a Partnership Implementation Committee (PIC) if the proposed partnership model is accepted by State Council.

The PIC will be responsible for:

- the refinement and integration of any recommended changes to the model;
- making formal application to the Commissioner of WA Police to establish the partnership;
- on-going negotiation with the WA Police to implement the partnership model, including the development of all webpage resources; and
- liaison with relevant State Government agencies to establish appropriate sources of funding to support the partnership.

3. Preparation and release of a media statement by the President of the State Council outlining the outcomes of the project and the State Council’s response to the project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following individuals and organisations for their assistance with the various project tasks and comments on draft versions of the report:

- Members of the Project Steering Committee;
- Ms Michelle Mackenzie and Mr Mal Shervill, Western Australian Local Government Association;
- Main Roads Western Australia;
- WA Police;
- Western Australian Office of Road Safety,
- Western Australian Local Government officers and elected members;
- Australian Institute of Traffic Planning and Management (WA branch); and
- Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (WA branch).

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the *Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project* was to investigate the potential role(s) for Western Australian Local Government in the management of speed enforcement. The project specifically relates to two of the Action Plan responsibilities for the Western Australian Local Government Association under the *Toward Zero* strategy, namely to:

- Investigate opportunities for Local Government to undertake enforcement activities (such as speed enforcement on local roads) [p. 11], and
- Research the role that Local Government can play in speed enforcement including sharing local traffic data with WA Police to allow targeted local enforcement [p. 18].

(*Toward Zero*-Recommended Implementation Plan 2009-2011, August 2008)

The project was divided into distinct phases of work toward the overall aim of proposing one or more models for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management in Western Australia. Phase One of the project, completed in April 2011 (see Palamara, Jones, Hildebrand & Langford, 2011), outlined the project and documented the *current* and *potential* role of Western Australian Local Government in the enforcement of speed limits and the broader relationship between Local Government and other speed management and enforcement stakeholders in Western Australia.

The main outcome of the Phase One plan of work was the identification of three broad options for the contribution by Local Government to the management of speed enforcement:

1. Autonomous and independent speed enforcement by Local Government on local area roads.
2. The establishment of a local area partnership between Local Government and police to share camera based enforcement.
3. Formalised vehicle speed monitoring by Local Government and sharing of the data with police to assist their targeted enforcement of speeding.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Following on from the identification of the above options, Phases Two and Three of the project sought to specify and refine the options into workable ‘Models’ via a sequence of consultative activities with Local Government representatives and other local road safety stakeholders such as WA Police, Main Roads WA, the Office of Road Safety and non-government organisations.

This report documents the tasks, methodologies and findings of Phases Two and Three of the project and the specification of a final model for Local Government involvement in the management of speed enforcement.

2. PHASE TWO

The specific objectives of this phase of the project were to:

- specify a number of interim models for the involvement of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement;
- obtain feedback from Local Government via a workshop on the acceptance and viability of these interim models for further development, and to
- undertake further development, including an economic analysis, of the interim models supported by Local Government representatives.

2.1 Specification of three interim models for Local Government participation in the management of speed enforcement

The three broad options for Local Government participation in the management of speed enforcement identified in Phase One of the project were reviewed by the Monash and Curtin University project personnel with the aim of developing specifications around the options which could then be reviewed by Local Government representatives (see Section 2.2 below). The resulting interim ‘Models’ of participation to be presented to Local Government representatives for review were as follows:

4. The operation of an automated speed camera program by Local Government with full deployment and financial control responsibilities and independence of police

- Local Government staff to use hand held digital camera under Road Traffic Act 1974 (WA) legislation permitting the appointment of Wardens or Special Constables to enforce road traffic laws.
- Consideration could be given to Local Government operation of:
 - combined speed and red light (intersection) camera operations;
 - ‘fixed’ black spot speed camera operation, and
 - ‘point to point’ speed camera operations in regional areas of WA
- Local Government would not be permitted to stop motorists to issue infringements.
- Local Government would be free to determine the location and frequency of their enforcement activities (based on the speed data generated by their vehicle traffic count programs) independent of police.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- Local Government would seek to either retain either whole or part of the funds generated by their camera program or establish with the State Government some other cost-recovery (+ ?) measure
- Funds would need to be sourced to cover the initial purchase of hand held digital cameras and other enforcement infrastructure.
- Processing of digital images would be done either by Local Government (least preferred) or alternatively upload to police administrative systems for processing (most preferred).

5. *The operation of an automated fixed and mobile speed camera program by Local Government under a local area partnership with police and financed by government under a road safety grants scheme*

- Local Government would establish formal partnerships with local area police to jointly manage speed camera (fixed) infrastructure and work in partnership with police to undertake roadside mobile speed enforcement (i.e., officers and police working as a cohesive local area 'road traffic' unit).
- Local Government would maintain a program of vehicle speed monitoring for use in the establishment of jointly determined targeted enforcement programs
- Funding of the program (infrastructure and personnel) would be on a cost-recovery basis, though start-up funds may be required or underwritten
- Partnership would use existing police administrative systems to process and issue infringement notices for speeding.

6. *The collection of and provision of vehicle travel speed information by Local Government to police to support the strategic deployment of enforcement resources by police on local area roads*

- Local Government to establish a formal and targeted program of on-going vehicle speed monitoring
- Formal agreement would be established with local area police to provide them with up to date vehicle speed data to identify local area roads where speeding is a problem

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- No enforcement to be undertaken by Local Government; their role is to provide data and administrative support to police
- Funds to support Local Government vehicle speed monitoring to be provided by police or sourced from elsewhere?

2.2 Workshop with Western Australian Local Government representatives to review the proposed interim models

2.2.1 Workshop participants and format

A workshop to discuss the relative merits and value of the three interim models of speed enforcement management was scheduled for August 4th, 2010. An invitation to attend the workshop (see Appendix A) was emailed to n=139 Western Australian Local Governments (which excludes Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands) and their elected members. Included with the invitation was a background briefing document (see Appendix B) which outlined the aims and objectives of the project, the findings to date from the Phase One project activities, the proposed interim models, and guiding questions/issues to facilitate discussion of the interim models.

Thirty-eight Local Government officers and elected members representing 24 Local Governments (nine *non-urban* and 15 *urban*) attended the workshop. Ten of the participating Local Governments had also completed the Phase One on-line survey (completed by 33 councils). The workshop commenced with a brief presentation and review of the aims and objectives of the project, the findings to date, the aims of the workshop, and the proposed workshop activities and format. Following this, delegates were organised into four discussion groups, one of which consisted of *non-urban* Local Government representatives only. A member of the project research team was then allocated to a group to facilitate the groups' consideration of each of the proposed interim models. Personnel from WALGA and C-MARC assisted the facilitators by taking notes to supplement the audio recordings of the group discussions.¹

After each group had concluded their discussion of the three models, the workshop participants reconvened as a group. Each of the group facilitators then summarised

¹ Due to a technical malfunction an audio recording was not made of one of the three *Urban* Local Government discussion groups.

their group's responses and recommendations for each of the interim models. This facilitated a whole of group discussion of the various models. At the conclusion of the workshop the group facilitators met to review the workshop activities and findings and to decide which of the interim models should be recommended for further development.

2.2.2 Summary of workshop discussions

Non-Urban Local Government group

The decision to run a separate group for the *non-urban* representatives was appreciated by the participants as they commented on the differing circumstances and issues for *non-urban* versus *urban* councils. In the first instance the participants considered that they *do not* have a serious crash or speeding problem. Road safety was not considered to be a high priority. Crashes and speeding are not considered to be a 'serious' issue on local roads but are recognised to be a problem on MRWA controlled roads. That said, speed is *thought to be a problem on roads passing through the centre of town* though the extent of speeding (and crashes for that matter) was admittedly unknown on these roads. Nevertheless, this prompted a call for fixed speed cameras on town centre roads. Despite the collection of vehicle movement data it seems that the speed data is not analysed due to an absence of staffing or capacity to process the data.

With respect to the proposed models or frameworks for Local Government participation, the *non-urban* representatives considered that Model 1 was "*not needed and would not work*". Model 2 was also rejected as "*impractical*". Model 3 was similar *unsupported* but was considered to be a somewhat better option than Models 1 and 2. Overall, there appeared to be strong agreement that *non-urban* Local Government *should not* be involved in the speed enforcement process.

It was concluded that the *non-urban* councils were seeking an integrated model of road safety for Local Government to deal with issues such as the following:

- simplified roadside clearing practices;
- increased State funding for the Black Spot Program (to 100%);
- a greater role in speed limit setting;

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- improved driver training to address the skills required for rural/country driving, and,
- an allocation of funds to divert vehicles, particularly heavy vehicles, from town centres.

It was also concluded that *non-urban* Local Governments should be provided with a report on crashes occurring on local area roads to assist their understanding of the nature and size of the road safety problem in their immediate localities as they seemed to have limited knowledge of these issues.

In conclusion, the *non-urban* Local Government participants considered that:

- speeding was not a major concern on their *local area* roads, except for roads passing through the centre of town;
- speeding is a significant problem on surrounding *major roads* controlled by MRWA;
- fixed speed camera or reduced speed limits might reduce speeds on roads passing through town centres;
- Local Government should have responsibility for setting posted speed limits on local area roads;
- that *non-urban* Local Government should *not* be involved in the management of speed enforcement;
- none of the proposed models or frameworks was acceptable though Model 3 was the *least unacceptable*, and,
- no alternative model was proposed or considered necessary.

Urban Local Government groups

Across the three *urban* Local Government discussion groups there was general agreement that speed compliance is a problem on local area roads. Secondly, there appeared to be general agreement that greater enforcement on local roads is required, and thirdly, that most Local Governments desired greater involvement in the speed enforcement process but not necessarily to the extent of having a 'hands-on' role in the deployment of speed cameras.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Two of the three *urban* Local Government discussion groups *rejected* Model 1 for a variety of reasons, including:

- the belief that speed enforcement is not a Local Government responsibility;
- not wanting to be responsible for penalising the local community and creating a punitive relationship with its community members;
- a perceived lack of skill, expertise and financial resources;
- concern about the integrity of Local Government to conduct a fair and equitable system that would not be open to ‘corruption’ and manipulation;
- concern that if Local Government took on an enforcement responsibility they would then be required to undertake an even greater role in traditional traffic enforcement;
- how Local Government could ‘dovetail’ their activities with police administrative systems currently used to issue infringement notices and deduct demerit points, and,
- the concern that if Local Government becomes responsible for the deployment of speed cameras police would start to withdraw their presence from local government areas more generally.

The third *urban* Local Government discussion group expressed somewhat greater acceptance of Model 1. There appeared to be agreement within this group that the proposed model could be implemented and would have a road safety benefit and be accepted by the community. This group did acknowledge that funding of the model would be a major issue. Local Government could not be expected to provide the ‘start-up’ funds to purchase cameras etc. and that only the cost of administering the program should be retained (by Local Government) from the revenue raised, with the remainder going into road safety programs. With respect to the issue of funding, there was some minor and qualified support for Model 1 from one of the other Model Local Government groups *if* the program could be administered on a cost-neutral basis or better still, produced some revenue for the council.

Model 2 received slightly more support, albeit qualified, than Model 1 across the three urban Local Government discussion groups. The qualifications were again around the issue of funding and how to share resources with police. This model was

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

least preferred by one group because the respective responsibilities were less clear' and could lead to the blurring of boundaries and enforcement responsibilities of Local Government and WA Police.

The most supported model of the three across the urban groups was Model 3. There was agreement that Model 3 reflected a more formalised version of existing, ad-hoc arrangements with WA Police and is really the minimum arrangement that should exist between Local Government and police. Despite this support all three urban groups acknowledged there were genuine resourcing implications for Model 3, particularly around the:

- supply and use of Metro Count equipment to collect data on vehicle speeds;
- additional resources required by Local Government to undertake increased vehicle traffic counts;
- resources required to undertake the analysis of the vehicle traffic data;
- how the data might be shared/supplied to police;
- additional resources required by WA Police to undertake targeted enforcement on local roads identified by Local Government, and,
- how police could be 'obligated' to undertake additional and strategic enforcement on road identified by Local Government.

Only one group identified an alternative model (Model 4). *Model 4* was seen to incorporate aspects of Models 1 and 2 but did not require Local Government to be responsible for the active deployment/use of speed cameras. Alternatively, Local Government would contribute to the cost of purchasing additional cameras that would be operated by police or sub-contractors. The revenue received from fines issued to motorists speeding on local roads would then be directed back to Local Government, with Local Government underwriting the cost of the program if the fine revenue did not fully cover the cost of the program. Local Government would also have the right to determine problem speeding areas in need of enforcement. This model would also make use of existing police administrative systems to issue infringements and follow-up offending motorists.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Resource and funding issues were acknowledged for Model 4, particularly in relation to initial start-up/camera purchase costs. One suggestion was to make application to the Road Trauma Trust Account, while another was to apply a levy to ratepayers, similar to that for council security services. Support for the levy would depend on the level of community concern for speeding.

Concluding comments and directions for development of the interim models

The clearest outcome from the workshop was that *non-urban* Local Government representatives did not support their sector's involvement in speed enforcement management. This position was somewhat stronger and more consistent than that expressed by *non-urban* Local Governments in the Phase One survey. Based on these two sources of evidence, there was some reason to consider the exclusion of non-urban Local Government from further project's activities and to concentrate on the Local Government urban sector that perceives speeding to be a problem and is most interested in working collaboratively with police to increase (strategic) enforcement.

From the debriefing provided by the facilitators of the *urban* Local Government groups, the accompanying group notes, and a review of the audio recordings there is mixed acceptance and rejection of the various models. No one model was wholly supported across the groups though Model 3 was the *least* unacceptable model. Model 3 was largely viewed as a more formalised undertaking of the very loose arrangement some Local Governments currently have with police and so should be developed further to support the existing relationship.

The alternative Model 4 received some support because it could increase the level of strategic enforcement via the use of sub-contractors without compromising the use of front line police resources. It was also thought the model would be more acceptable to the community since Local Government personnel would not be the *face of the enforcement* but a strategic, backroom partner in the process.

Upon review of the workshop summaries and with consideration of other likely developments in the State's automated camera enforcement program², the following

² WA Police were intending to release an Expression of Interest for services to undertake various components of the State's automated speed camera enforcement program

conclusions were reached by the project research team and the Project Steering Committee for the development of the interim models:

- Model 1 be rejected;
- Model 4 be rejected;
- Model 2 be developed further;
- Model 3 be developed further, and that
- future project activities include both non-urban and urban Local Governments.

2.3 Development and economic costing for Model 3 and Model 2

In line with the above recommendations Models 2 and 3 were the focus of further development and an economic analysis. This task involved consultation with a number of groups including various Local Governments, state government departments (eg., Main Roads WA, Office of Road Safety), WA Police, commercial vehicle traffic count companies, and Australian agents of speed camera technologies.

The economic analysis comprised two main components:

- (i) Estimating the additional cost involved in Local Government undertaking speed enforcement in their councils.
- (ii) Estimating the additional revenue raised from the additional enforcement activities.

In undertaking the economic analysis, Model 3 was incorporated as an element within Model 2 as it was assumed formalised data monitoring and sharing of information would be a necessary element of the partnership between Local Government and police.

2.3.1 Model 3

Partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

2.3.1.1 Background

One of the criteria used by WA Police for the deployment of speed cameras is that the posted speed limit for the road must be exceeded by 15% of vehicles. WA Local Government is in a strong position to assist in the identification of roads meeting this criterion through vehicle traffic monitoring the majority of councils undertake as part of their on-going commitment to manage local roads. The Phase One survey of Local Government identified:

- that all respondent *Urban* councils and 80% of the respondent *Non-Urban* councils undertake some level of vehicle traffic monitoring;
- that only two respondent councils reported sharing vehicle traffic data with police for speed enforcement purposes, and that
- the selection of vehicle traffic count sites, the frequency of activity, and the review and use of the collected speed data by councils is ‘ad hoc and devoid of a framework to support the speed management activities of councils and how police might use speed data supplied by councils.

Consequently, Model 3 proposes a framework to formalise the collection of vehicle traffic count speed data by councils and the sharing of this information with WA Police to support a targeted *camera* and where appropriate *non-camera* based speed enforcement program, particularly on lower volume, lower posted speed roads.

The general parameters of Model 3 are as follows:

- The model is applicable to both urban and non-urban councils though it is understood that some councils, particularly the smaller non-urban councils, may be less likely to adopt the proposed strategy if speeding is not considered to be a problem on their local area roads or if their speed enforcement requirements are being met under existing arrangements with WA Police.
- Under the model councils would conduct a more systematic and strategic vehicle traffic count program that would also provide intelligence for their

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

existing speed management activities (e.g., road work and engineering initiatives).

- Details of the roads identified by councils meeting the criteria for enforcement would be uploaded via the Internet to a central database which would be accessible by WA Police.
- WA Police would contribute to the ongoing management of the local roads database by updating details on the road with information on the enforcement undertaken (e.g., type and amount of enforcement) and the outcomes of that enforcement (e.g., percentage of vehicles exceeding the posted and enforceable speed limits).
- It is intended that WA Police would make the final decision regarding which local roads identified by Local Government are indeed subject to enforcement, though it is expected that WA Police and Local Government would agree on a protocol that ensures all problem local roads receive an appropriate level of enforcement.
- The model does not describe or seek to cover the financial costs for the use of the data with respect to the required hours of enforcement. It is assumed that additional hours of enforcement and associated costs would be addressed under the best practice in speed enforcement strategy recently developed for the State (see Cameron, 2008).

2.3.1.2 Aim

The overall aim of the model is to provide WA Police with a timely source of quality, local area vehicle travel speed information that can be used to strategically deploy *camera* and even *non-camera* police resources to problem area roads (i.e., roads where a minimum of 15% of vehicles exceed the posted speed limit) to reduce the incidence of speeding.

2.3.1.3 Objectives

The specific objectives of the Model are to provide a framework for:

- for the frequency, volume and quality of vehicle traffic counts conducted by participating councils (categorised by length of local area sealed road);
- the supply of local area vehicle speed data by participating councils to WA Police, and

- the use of vehicle speed data by WA Police in their speed enforcement activities.

2.3.1.4 Classification of Local Government by length of sealed road

For the purposes of developing relevant traffic count targets, Local Government were broadly categorised into *small*, *medium* and *large* based of the length of sealed road within their area (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Classification of Local Government by length of sealed road

Local Government Category	Length of local government area sealed road	Example
Small	< 100 kilometres	Narrogin, Claremont; East Fremantle; Cottesloe; Bassendean
Medium	100-450 kilometres	Mingenew, Subiaco; Belmont, Kwinana
Large	>450 kilometres	Albany, Melville; Joondalup; Gosnells; Stirling

2.3.1.5 Proposed targets and methods for weekly/annual traffic counts

The on-line survey of Local Government vehicle traffic count activity identified considerable diversity among councils for the frequency and number of counts conducted, who undertakes the counts (council versus contractor), and the protocols for undertaking counts. One objective of this Model is to increase the frequency, volume and quality of vehicle travel speed data collected by Local Government to assist WA Police to strategically target speeding motorists.

For each of the *small*, *medium* and *large* councils in the metropolitan area the proposed guidelines for the number of weekly (based on 40 weeks of counts per annum) vehicle traffic counts are presented in Table 2.2. The number of weekly and annual counts is modelled on the number of counts currently conducted by a number of Local Governments of varying size.

Table 2.2 Weekly and annual traffic count targets by Local Government classification

Local Government Category	Weekly counts	Annual counts (40 weeks)
Small	5	200
Medium	10	400
Large	15	600

The annual counts would be spread across the various road types (District Distributor A; District Distributor B; Local Distributor, and Access) to collect timely vehicle speed data across a *broad range of road types* to determine priority roads for speed enforcement by police. Local Governments would be expected to allocate a proportion of annual counts per road type in accord with a number of criteria, including the:

- percentage of road types within their local area;
- previously identified areas of speeding and crash occurrence, and
- complaints about speeding from residents.

Local Governments would be expected to support the vehicle traffic count program with the appropriate personnel to:

- determine the program of vehicle traffic count activity and to provide ongoing monitoring of the count program;
- undertake the required counts (or alternatively sub-contract the required counts)
- prepare and/or interpret vehicle travel count reports; and to
- prepare the necessary documentation to forward to WA Police to inform them of priority roads for speed enforcement.

2.3.1.6 Provision of speed data to WA Police

Under this model, the primary criterion for the reporting of a road to police for speed enforcement would be if the posted speed is exceeded by 15% of monitored vehicle at the count site and there *are no other viable engineering or road treatment options available to counter vehicle speeds*. It is expected that councils would provide WA Police with a fortnightly listing of roads where this criterion applies. The details provided to police should include the following:

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- the precise location (inclusive of Straight Line Kilometres -SLK) of the traffic count;
- monitoring dates;
- summary data for the volume of vehicles; minimum, maximum and average speeds; the proportion of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit, and the proportion of vehicles exceeding the speed limit in 5km/hour intervals; and,
- peak time(s) of day and day(s) of week for speeding in excess of the posted speed limit by proportion of vehicles.

It is proposed that Local Government would provide the data to police by uploading the information via the Internet to a secure database accessible by police. Such a system would need to be developed and financed and agreement reached regarding who would act as the administrator of the system (WA Police or Local Government). Using the information provided by Local Government and other information available to police (e.g., location of serious injury crashes involving speed), WA Police would prioritise those metropolitan and rural roads requiring enforcement and the appropriate mode of enforcement (e.g., automated mobile cameras for high volume roads or hand-held lasers for lower volume roads). It is expected that WA Police, in consultation with Local Government, would develop an abiding protocol for the amount of enforcement to be undertaken on various road types within a local area. This would ensure that lower volume, lower posted speed roads where speed is a problem receive the required enforcement.

It is beyond the scope of this model to speculate on the required number of hours of police enforcement to address the level of speeding identified by Local Government. It is possible however, that the required hours of enforcement can be provided under the proposed best practice strategy for enhanced speed enforcement in Western Australia developed by Cameron (2008). This comprehensive strategy details the deployment hours for fixed and mobile cameras and mobile laser cameras on both urban and rural roads.

2.3.1.7 *Cost of vehicle traffic counts and associated administration*

The most significant on-going cost associated with this model is the proposed program of vehicle traffic counts. Calculating the projected costs of an expanded

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

program of vehicle traffic counts cannot however, be based on the past cost to councils since most respondents to the on-line survey failed to provide sufficient information on either the number of traffic counts conducted per annum or the cost of their annual vehicle traffic count program. What has been established is that councils use a variety of means to undertake their vehicle traffic count programs, including using their own Metro Count equipment and personnel; the outsourcing of count activities to contractors such as Traffic Logistics Australia (TLA), and a combination of both activities.

Indicative costs for the proposed expanded vehicle traffic count program are subsequently based on the range of charges specified by TLA for each count. The charge per count varies between \$95 per (if TLA uses council equipment) and \$135 (if TLA uses their own equipment), with an average cost of \$115. Based on this information the upper and lower and average cost per annum for the *number of counts* specified for each council grouping is presented in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Range and average annual cost of vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification

Council Category	Range of Cost of Counts (\$)	Average Cost (\$)
Small	19,000-27,000	23,000
Medium	38,000-54,000	46,000
Large	57,000-81,000	69,000

In addition to the above, the following annual costs would also apply for hours of administration (over 40 weeks) of the traffic count program by the council (see Table 2.4). Administration activities include managing the traffic count program, liaising with required contractors (if required), preparation of reports, uploading count data to the information management system, and communications with WA Police. The hourly administration cost is based on the rate of pay (without penalties) for a Local Government ranger.

Table 2.4 Annual administrative hours and associated costs for vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification

Local Government Category	Annual Hours of Administration	Annual Cost (\$) (@ \$31.91 per hour)
Small	80	2,552.80
Medium	120	3,829.20
Large	160	5,105.60

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Together, Tables 2.3 and 2.4 provide indicative costs for undertaking the annual program of vehicle traffic counts. These figures are indicative because they are based on an assumption of the number of weekly counts that a council of a given size *could* conduct, and secondly, because individual councils may opt to use their own staff and equipment to conduct their traffic count program, which may be cheaper or more expensive than the costing based on the TLA charges.

The first limitation on the costing is the absence of provisions for the establishment of an information system for communicating the vehicle traffic count data to WA Police and police's administration of the system to record enforcement activity and the outcome of that activity. A precise estimate of the cost would initially require a detailed assessment of the existing systems and resources of Local Government and WA Police and of the performance requirements of the system. This requirement is beyond the scope of this modelling and should be undertaken by an information systems expert. Discussions with one information management systems developer suggested that development and establishment costs could easily range between \$50,000-\$100,000 (personal communication Rory Murray, IT consultant, 4th March 2011).

The second limitation to the costing is the inability to account for hours of required enforcement on problem roads identified by Local Government. However, there may be no additional cost for this activity if the required hours of enforcement are provided for under the proposed enhanced speed enforcement program developed by Cameron (2008).

2.3.1.8 Funding of the Local Government vehicle traffic count program

There are a number of options for the financial support of the proposed vehicle traffic count program:

- Some Local Governments, particularly the larger metropolitan councils, are already committed to a vehicle traffic count program of the proposed size so there will be minimal additional cost for these councils.
- Other Local Governments who cannot commit the financial resources to support the proposed program could consider applications to the following

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

groups to fund an initial year to ‘trial’ the process as a speed counter-measure under the *Toward Zero* road safety strategy:

- RoadWise Community Road Safety Grant Scheme
- Western Australia Road Safety Council
- Adjoining Local Governments might also consider a resource sharing arrangement if councils have the capacity to sub-contract their equipment and personnel to another council on a cost recovery basis, which might be cheaper than engaging a contractor such as TLA.
- Some smaller Local Governments might also consider the option of imposing a very modest (no more than \$5.00 per elector per annum) *Community Road Safety* levy to raise the required funds to support the long-term viability of the proposed vehicle count program. For example, if the Town of East Fremantle (categorised as a ‘small’ council) imposed an annual \$5.00 levy on its 4,921 electors it would raise approximately \$24,605, which is around 0.0051% of the rates levied in 2008/2009.

2.3.1.9 Legislative amendments to support the model

No legislative or regulatory amendments would be required to support this model.

2.3.2 Model 2

Partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

2.3.2.1 Background

Enforcement, particularly automated camera based enforcement, is an effective countermeasure to speeding. This fact underscores the camera based technologies and increased hours of camera based enforcement proposed by Cameron (2008) as ‘best practice’ to strategically manage speeding on Western Australian roads. The Phase One report for this project highlights the role Local Government can play in relation to this ‘best practice’ strategy, particularly in regard to their potential use of the highly mobile Laser Technology Incorporated (LTI) Trucam digital speed camera to undertake enforcement on lower volume, lower speed roads. The use of Local Government personnel to undertake camera based speed enforcement on local area roads would not only increase the level of enforcement across the road network,

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

which is in line with the general aim of the best practice strategy, but would also minimise the need for WA Police to deploy valuable personnel to problem area roads most suited to LTI Trucam enforcement. Both the Phase One on-line survey and the Phase Two workshop showed there is some support, particularly among metropolitan councils more so than rural councils, to contribute to speed enforcement beyond the contribution of contemporary intelligence on speeding on local area roads (Model 3 above).

The general parameters of the model are as follows:

- The model extends the role of Local Government identified in Model 3 to include their participation in roadside speed enforcement.
- It is assumed that Local Governments' adoption of Model 2 would be based on the strategic information on vehicle travel speeds they provide under Model 3.
- The model is based on the use of a specific digital speed camera, that being the Laser Technology Incorporated (LTI) Trucam, and the use of the camera in the automatic detection mode *only*.
- The LTI Trucam digital speed cameras could be purchased by WA Police because of their competitive purchasing powers and 'loaned' to participating councils for use, or, purchased/leased by councils or consortiums of councils with the purchase/leasing price refunded by the State.
- As with Model 3, an appropriate Internet based system would need to be developed and implemented to permit the remote uploading by councils of digital camera images for processing by WA Police.
- The model assumes that WA Police will maintain full '*back end*' responsibility for the processing of all digital images uploaded by Local Government and for the issue of Traffic Infringement Notices to the owners of offending vehicles. Costs for the processing of infringements are represented in the economic analysis of the model.
- In cases where the Traffic Infringement Notice is to be adjudicated by the court, it is expected that Local Government camera operators will attend court to give evidence and that costs for this attendance will be recouped under the established compensation agreement between police, the State Government and

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

individual councils. Police will continue to prepare and finance the prosecuting brief.

- Though the model is particularly relevant to lower volume, lower speed roads which are not typically subject to automated camera enforcement, costings for the model have also included higher volume, higher speed roads should the LTI Trucam be deployed to these roads.
- The model is proposed and costed on a '*per hour of enforcement*' basis and is based on a minimum 2 hours of enforcement (plus administration) per weekday for costing purposes. Thus the model does not specify a cost for the 'total enforcement program' since councils may choose to do more or less hours of enforcement;
- It is expected that WA Police and participating councils would liaise to determine the weekly camera enforcement activity (i.e., location, hours) to be undertaken by council.

2.3.2.2 Aim

The overall aim of the model is to develop a framework for the utilisation of Local Government personnel across Western Australia in the use of visible, automated camera enforcement to help reduce speeding across the road network, particularly on lower volume, lower speed local roads where speeding is identified as problem.

2.3.2.3 Objectives

The specific objectives of the model are to:

- specify the assumptions underlying the development of costings for the contribution of Local Government to camera based speed enforcement;
- specify the assumptions underlying the calculation of revenue raised through enforcement;
- provide estimates of the cost per hour of camera based enforcement undertaken by Local Government by size of council (i.e., small, medium, large) and type of road;
- provide estimates of revenue and net revenue raised from Local Government camera based speed enforcement per hour of enforcement by size of council and road type.

2.3.2.4 Procedures for the operation of the Local Government speed camera program

It is assumed that the Local Government speed camera program would be staffed by Rangers. For modelling purposes, a total of four hours per day have been allocated to Rangers for administration of the program (2 hours) and roadside enforcement (2 hours). The Rangers would be trained in the use of the LTI Trucam which would be deployed in the automatic mode only. Rangers would not be permitted to use the camera in the manual operation mode (i.e., point and shoot) and as such would have no authority to stop motorists. All infringements would be issued by WA Police.

Using the vehicle traffic speed information collected under Model 3, Local Government Rangers would liaise with WA Police to establish a weekly schedule for the deployment of their camera. Council staff would update the database described in Model 3 with this schedule, noting the number of hours of operation and time at the particular site. WA Police would in turn update the database with the outcomes of that enforcement (e.g., percentage of vehicle exceeding the posted and enforceable speed limit) from the digital images they process.

Local Government staff would be required to upload their digital images remotely via the Internet to a secure, centralised data storage area. WA Police would in turn upload these images directly into the Image and Infringement Management System (IIMS) for processing. At present, the IIMS is unable to 'batch load' digital images from the LTI Trucam though this is expected to be resolved by the end of April 2011.

Under this model WA Police would have full administrative and financial responsibility for the processing of digital images, the issue of Traffic Infringement Notices, and for the preparation of briefs when the owner of the offending vehicle or nominated driver chooses to resolve the matter in court. The Local Government operator of the camera would however, be expected to attend court. Local Government would be financially compensated for this time, though it may not cover the full cost of the Ranger's absence from other duties which might otherwise generate revenue for the council (e.g., issuing parking infringement notices).

2.3.2.5 Cost analysis of Local Government speed camera enforcement activities

Costs involved in undertaking the Local Government speed camera program include operator costs, speed detector equipment, the support vehicle, processing the images

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

and follow up, software for electronic upload of images, additional vehicle speed monitoring, data monitoring and sharing of information, and community education. Given the early stage of development of the model, many assumptions were necessary in determining these costs.

The approach adopted was to calculate the cost estimates based on an enforcement hour as the costing unit. Costs were calculated separately for the different types of road, with a distinction made between access roads with a daily volume of less than 3,000 vehicles, local distributor roads with between 3,000 and 7,000 vehicles, district distributor roads with 7,000 to 20,000 vehicles, and district distributor roads with 15,000 to 35,000 vehicles. A distinction was also made between small, medium, and large sized councils.

The assumptions used in developing the cost segment of the model are shown in Table 2.5. Where possible, parameter values were evidence-based and sourced from published reports or personal communication with key stakeholders. However, some parameter values are based on ‘best estimates’ and will need to be, if required, refined as the project progresses through future stages.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 2.5 Assumptions used in developing the cost segment of the local government speed enforcement model

Cost component	Item	Parameter estimate	Source
Handheld LTI Trucam digital speed camera	Purchase price	\$14,000	Laser Technology Incorporated
	Annual maintenance cost	\$330	As above
	Useful life of camera	7 years	As above
	Discount rate	5%	Western Australian Treasury Corporation ¹
	Daily operation hrs. (admin and enforcement)	4 hrs.	Assumption
Support vehicle	Operating cost per hour	\$4.90	City of Stirling
	Depreciation cost per hr.	\$2.35	As above
Camera operator	Base salary of ranger	\$46,000 plus on-costs of 15%	City of Stirling
	Daily operating hrs. on enforcement	2 hrs. each weekday	Assumption
	Daily admin/travel/ setup hrs.	2 hrs. each weekday	As above
	Training	\$1500	As above
	Useful life of training	3 years	As above
	No. of rangers implementing enforcement for small/medium/large councils respectively	1 / 3 / 5	As above
Image processing and follow up	Number of passing vehicles per hour of enforcement	75% of mean daily traffic (by road type and assuming 12 hrs. of traffic)	Assumption
	Offence detection rate per enforcement hour	2%	Radalj & Sultana (2009) ²
	Processor cost per 1000 offences detected	\$150.38	Cameron & Delaney (2006), indexed to 2010 prices ³
	Court appearance rate per offence detected	0.278%	Enhancement Speed Enforcement Program.
	Court costs per court appearance	\$400	As above
Software for electronic upload of images	Cost to develop, purchase, install	\$250,000	Assumption
	Useful life	7 years	As above
Additional speed monitoring	Current annual no. of counts for small/medium/large councils respectively	200 / 400 / 600	City of Stirling
	% increase in annual no. of speed surveys	15%	Assumption
	Cost per additional survey	\$115	Traffic Logistics Australia
Data monitoring and sharing of information	Monthly hrs. for small/medium/large council respectively	4 hrs. / 6 hrs. / 8 hrs.	Assumption
Community education	Nil (based on assumption that the bulk of community education will be through council notices and circulars, features in local newspapers, etc.)		

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Table 2.6 shows the estimates of the various cost components of Local Government speed enforcement by enforcement hour, type of road and size of council.

Table 2.6 Estimates of the cost of Local Government speed enforcement per enforcement hour, by type of road and size of council

Cost components	Type of road			
	Access roads	Local distributor roads	District distributor roads	
	No. of vehicles per day			
	<3000	3000-7000	7000-20000	15000-35000
Base number	1500	5000	13500	25000
Speed camera				
Cost per enforcement hr.	\$2.64	\$2.64	\$2.64	\$2.64
Support vehicle				
Cost per enforcement hr.	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25
Camera operator				
Cost per enforcement hr. (including training)	\$31.91	\$31.91	\$31.91	\$31.91
Admin cost per enforcement hr.	\$31.91	\$31.91	\$31.91	\$31.91
Image processing and follow up				
Cost per enforcement hr.	\$2.37	\$7.89	\$21.30	\$39.45
Software for electronic upload				
Cost per enforcement hr.	\$0.97	\$0.97	\$0.97	\$0.97
Additional vehicle speed monitoring				
Cost per enforcement hr.				
Small council	\$16.59	\$16.59	\$16.59	\$16.59
Medium-sized council	\$11.06	\$11.06	\$11.06	\$11.06
Large council	\$9.95	\$9.95	\$9.95	\$9.95
Data monitoring and sharing of information				
Cost per enforcement hr.				
Small council	\$1.45	\$1.45	\$1.45	\$1.45
Medium-sized council	\$0.73	\$0.73	\$0.73	\$0.73
Large council	\$0.58	\$0.58	\$0.58	\$0.58
Community education				
Cost per enforcement hr.	-	-	-	-
Total cost per enforcement hour				
Small council	\$95	\$101	\$114	\$132
Medium-sized council	\$89	\$94	\$108	\$126
Large council	\$88	\$93	\$107	\$125

Overall, the cost varied from \$86 for large councils on access roads to \$132 per hour for small councils on high volume district distributor roads. Underlying these differences are the additional processing and follow up costs from the increase in the

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

number of offences on higher volume roads, the additional speed monitoring undertaken by the councils with a larger local road area, and the additional time required for data monitoring and sharing of information by medium and larger size councils.

2.3.2.6 Revenue raised from Local Government speed enforcement activities

The additional speed enforcement activities will raise revenue from fines paid by offending motorists. A similar approach was adopted for the revenue estimates as in the cost estimates, with expected revenue based of an enforcement hour. The assumptions adopted for estimating the revenue are presented in Table 2.7 (based on a conservative average fine of \$75.00)

Table 2.7 Assumptions used in developing the model of the revenue raised through Local Government speed enforcement

Revenue component	Parameter estimate	Source
Mean value of fine	\$75	Assumption
Fine payment rate	80% of fines paid in the First Notice or on Final Demand; the Fines Enforcement Registry collect 85% of outstanding fines	Enhanced Speed Enforcement Program

The estimates of the revenue raised per enforcement hour are shown in Table 2.8. It varies by road type from \$136 per enforcement hour on access roads to \$2,273 per enforcement hour on high volume district distributor roads.

Table 2.8 Estimates of the revenue raised from Local Government speed enforcement per enforcement hour

Revenue	Type of road			
	Access roads	Local distributor roads	District distributor roads	
		No. of vehicles per day		
	<3000	3000-7000	7000-20000	15000-35000
Base number	1500	5000	13500	25000
<i>Revenue per enforcement hour</i> Small, medium-sized and large councils	\$136	\$455	\$1,228	\$2,273

2.3.2.7 Net revenue derived from Local Government speed enforcement activities

Net revenue is the difference between the revenue raised from Local Government speed enforcement and the costs incurred. Based on the assumptions used in developing the revenue and cost segments of the model, net revenue from Local

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Government speed enforcement activities was positive for all scenarios, with a minimum value of \$41 per enforcement hour for small councils implementing speed enforcement on access roads to \$2,149 for large councils implementing enforcement on high volume district distributor roads (see Table 2.9).

Table 2.9 Estimates of the net revenue derived from local government speed enforcement per enforcement hour, by type of road and size of local council

Revenue	Type of road			
	Access roads	Local distributor roads	District distributor roads	
			No. of vehicles per day	
	<3000	3000-7000	7000-20000	15000-35000
<i>Total revenue per enforcement hour</i>				
Small council	\$41	\$354	\$1 114	\$2 141
Medium sized council	\$48	\$360	\$1 120	\$2 148
Large council	\$49	\$362	\$1 121	\$2 149

2.3.2.8 Funding the contribution of Local Government to speed camera enforcement

Local Government has clearly specified that any contribution on their part to speed enforcement management, above what is already undertaken (eg. their vehicle travel speed monitoring programs), would need to be financed to offset costs to council. This is a particularly vexing problem for this model since there are currently no legislative or regulatory provisions that would allow the State to finance Local Government contribution to camera based enforcement. As detailed in Section 4.2 of the Phase One report (Palamara et al., 2011), revenue raised by the automated camera enforcement technology is distributed to the Road Trauma Trust Account (RTTA) to finance ‘road safety’ related activities and to Treasury under consolidate revenue. RTTA monies cannot be used to purchase additional digital speed cameras but may be used to purchase additional hours of police enforcement, some of which could possibly be ‘redirected’ to Local Government to cover the administrative and personnel costs of camera based enforcement.

Funds for the purchase of additional digital speed cameras would still need to be sourced. Options for this include:

- using existing WA Police funds to cover the cost of additional cameras, perhaps as part of the proposed best practice speed strategy funding model; or

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- requiring councils individually or as a consortium to finance the purchase or lease of cameras and for this cost to be offset by a higher administrative charge for the deployment of the camera.

The cost to the State for the processing by WA Police of speed camera generated infringements must also be considered. While the costing for the model suggests the program would be revenue positive, additional funds might still be required by WA Police if the number of infringements generated by Local Government enforcement are in addition to those speculated under the proposed best practice strategy as opposed to being counted as part of the strategy.

Funding of this model clearly requires higher level consideration by and input from agencies and individuals whose responsibilities are closely aligned with possible sources of finance for this model.

2.3.2.9 *Legislative amendments to support the model*

There are number of legislative and regulatory issues surrounding Local Government's operation of a speed measurement device and their authority to enforce speed limits on public roads. These issues were discussed in Section 4.2.2 of the Phase One report (Palamara et al., 2011). Essentially the Commissioner of Police has the power to authorise an individual's use of a speed measurement device and to appoint individuals as 'Wardens' or as 'Special Constables' to enforce specific road traffic laws. This could apply to Local Government personnel.

It is recommended that a detailed review of these provisions be undertaken by a legal practitioner.

3. PHASE THREE

The specific objectives of this phase of the project were to:

- develop and implement an on-line survey to obtain feedback from WA Local Government representatives, police, and other local road safety stakeholders on the viability and acceptance of Model 2 and Model 3;
- to further refine one or both of the Models in line with the findings of the on-line survey, and to,
- obtain final feedback from a sample of Local Government representatives on the proposed final Model(s).

3.1 On-line survey of Local Government, WA Police, and other local road safety stakeholders

The intention of the survey was to obtain feedback from Western Australian Local Government, WA Police, and other local road safety stakeholders on Model 2 and Model 3 described above.

3.1.1 Methodology

3.1.1.1 Ethics

This research was undertaken with the approval of the Human Research Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University of Technology (approval SPH-5-2010). Potential respondents were informed that electronic submission of the survey would be accepted as their understanding of and consent to the requirements of participation detailed at the survey site. Though the identity of participant groups (not individuals) would be reported to the project managers -the Western Australian Local Government Association- respondent groups were given the option of having their responses remain anonymous and not aligned with their identity.

3.1.1.2 Survey development and completion

Three versions of the on-line survey were constructed (see Appendix D) using *Survey Monkey*. All three versions contained a set of common statements and questions about Models 2 and 3, while the versions distributed to Local Government and WA Police contained additional statements and questions related to their proposed contributions under Models 2 and 3.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Prior to release, all survey statements and questions were reviewed by selected members of the Project Steering Committee and the project sponsor. The facing page of the survey provided background information on the project and the requirements and responsibilities of participation for both respondents and the survey administrator (C-MARC). Once respondents commenced the survey they could suspend and return to the survey as necessary. Once the survey was submitted respondents were unable to re-access and amend their submission.

3.1.1.3 Contact and sampling of Western Australian Local Government, WA Police and other road safety stakeholders

In consultation with the Project Steering Committee it was agreed that all n=139 WA Local Governments (which excludes Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands) should be invited to participate in the survey. It was also agreed the invitation to participate should be extended to the Chief Executive Officer *and* the Mayor/President of the Local Government so that these executives might confer to provide a unified position for each Local Government.

A listing of organisations and individuals representing other local road safety stakeholders was proposed by the Project Steering Committee. This listing consisted of:

- the Western Australian Office of Road Safety;
- Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA);
- Royal Automobile Club (WA) (RAC WA);
- Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (WA Branch) (IPWEA), and
- the Australian Institute of Traffic Planning and Management (WA Branch) (AITPM)

For operational reasons WA Police preferred that only the State Commander of Traffic respond on behalf of that organisation. Upon review of the survey, the Office of Road Safety, RAC WA, IPWEA and AITPM similarly recommended that they provide a 'corporate' response rather than have multiple personnel complete the survey. In contrast, MRWA were happy for all of their nominated personnel (n=17) to complete the survey rather than provide a single 'corporate' response.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Invitations were issued via email (see Appendix C) to the nominated Local Government personnel, the WA Police State Commander for Traffic, and the nominated local road safety stakeholder representatives. Included with the email was a background briefing document describing Model 2 and Model 3 (as per the details presented in Section 2.3 of this report) and a hard copy version of the on-line survey for review. The on-line survey remained open for approximately three weeks.

3.1.1.4 Data management and analysis

At the conclusion of the survey period the responses were downloaded from *Survey Monkey* into SPSS (Version 18). The data was then visually inspected for completeness and non-conforming responses. Where necessary, respondents were contacted by telephone to clarify non-conforming responses or to obtain a response for survey items that appeared to have been overlooked. The integrity of the data was further checked through an examination of the frequency counts. Because of the small number of respondents the analysis of the data was restricted to descriptive frequency counts for the Local Government (by *urban* versus *non-urban*) and other road safety stakeholders respondents. The analysis of the qualitative survey items was restricted to the reporting of main themes and issues.

3.1.1.5 Details of respondents

Completed surveys were submitted by:

- 29 Local Governments (14 urban; 15 non-urban), representing 20.8% of those invited;
- the State Commander for Traffic, WA Police, and
- eight local road safety stakeholders, representing four of the five invited organisations.

Sixteen of the 29 Local Government respondents requested that their identity remain anonymous to the project sponsor (WALGA), while five of the other local road safety stakeholders also requested anonymity. WA Police elected for their responses to be identified to the project sponsor. Table 3.1 details the identity and employment position of Local Government respondents who *did not* request anonymity.

Table 3.1 Identifiable Local Government and employment position of respondent

Local Government	Employment Position
City of Rockingham	Coordinator of Traffic Services
City of Subiaco	Manager Field Services
City of Perth	Urban Designer
Shire of Mundaring	Director Infrastructure Services
City of Gosnells	Director Infrastructure
City of Melville	Executive Engineer-design
Town of Kwinana	Traffic & Asset Engineer
City of Canning	Traffic Engineer
City of Fremantle	Traffic & Design Officer
Town of Vincent	Manager Ranger and Community Safety Services
City of Armadale	Manager Engineering, Traffic & Design
City of Bayswater	Director Technical Services
Shire of Trayning	Chief Executive Officer
Shire of Kalgoorlie-Boulder	Manager Engineering Services
Shire of Capel	Director Technical Services
Shire of Williams	Chief Executive Officer
Shire of Murray	Manager Design & Asset Services
Shire of Harvey	Executive Manager Technical Services
Shire of Cue	Chief Executive Officer
Shire of Plantagenet	Coordinator of Traffic Services

3.1.2 Survey findings for Model 3

The survey findings for Model 3 are presented below and are structured according to *common* (all three respondent groups) and *specific* issues (for Local Government and WA Police). It should be noted that none of the findings have been tested for statistical significance due to the small number of respondents.

3.1.2.1 Common Issues

Improved understanding of local area roads requiring enforcement

There was uniform agreement among WA Police, Local Government, and other road safety stakeholders (ORSS) that the supply of data on speeding by Local Government to WA Police would improve their understanding of which local roads required speed enforcement. This belief was strongest among the ORSS compared with WA Police and Local Government, and stronger again among urban Local Government compared with non-urban.

Table 3.2 The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve the police’s understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	3.4
Disagree	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	3.4
Unsure/ Don’t Know	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agree	6	42.9	8	53.3	14	48.3
Strongly Agree	8	57.1	5	33.3	13	44.8
Total	14	100	15	100	29	100

Table 3.3 The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve police’s understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don’t Know	0	0.0
Agree	6	75.0
Strongly Agree	2	25.0
Total	8	100.0

Impact on local area speeding

Similarly, all three respondent groups agreed that the enforcement of speeding by WA Police on roads identified as a problem by Local Government would help reduce local area speeding. This belief was strongest among the Local Government sector, particularly urban Local Governments (35% *Strongly Agree*).

Table 3.4 WA Police enforcement of vehicle speed on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	2	13.3	2	6.9
Unsure/ Don’t Know	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.4
Agree	8	57.1	10	66.7	18	62.1
Strongly Agree	5	35.7	3	20.0	8	27.6
Total	14	100	15	100	29	100

Table 3.5 WA Police enforcement of vehicle speeds on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	25.0
Agree	5	62.5
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Funding priority under Toward Zero

WA Police did *not* consider that the proposed Model 3 partnership with Local Government was a funding priority under the state's *Toward Zero* road safety strategy, which is contrary to approximately a third of Local Government and ORSS who did.

Table 3.6 The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	0	0.0	2	6.9
Disagree	5	35.7	5	33.3	10	34.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	5	35.7	6	40.0	11	37.9
Agree	1	7.1	3	20	4	13.8
Strongly Agree	1	7.1	1	6.7	2	6.9
Total	14	100	15	100	29	100

Table 3.7 The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	3	37.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	1	12.5
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Value for money

WA Police were unsure whether Model 3 represented good value for money, which was also the case for most Local Government respondents (55.2%) and 37.5% of

ORSS respondents. An identical proportion of ORSS also considered the proposed partnership represented good value for money.

Table 3.8 The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money (Local Government Stakeholders)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.4
Disagree	0	0.0	2	13.3	2	6.9
Unsure/ Don't Know	8	57.1	8	53.3	16	55.2
Agree	4	28.6	4	26.7	8	27.6
Strongly Agree	1	7.1	1	6.7	2	6.9
Total	14	100	15	100	29	100

Table 3.9 The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	1	12.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Mandatory surveillance and supply of local area road speed data

The three respondent groups agreed that it should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to police for enforcement purposes. Opposition to mandatory surveillance and reporting was strongest among Local Government, particularly the urban Local Governments.

Table 3.10 It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement; Local Government respondents (Local Government Stakeholders)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	2	14.3	2	7.1
Disagree	3	21.4	2	14.3	5	17.9
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	7.1	2	14.3	3	10.7
Agree	7	50.0	4	28.6	11	39.3
Strongly Agree	3	21.4	4	28.6	7	25.0
Total	14	100	14	100	28	100

Table 3.11 It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	25.0
Agree	6	75.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Enforcement of speeding on Local Government identified problem roads

WA Police did *not* agree they should always provide enforcement on local roads where speeding has been identified by Local Government to be a problem. Whilst most Local Government respondents (85.7%) believed WA Police should, ORSS respondents were somewhat divided in their support for this requirement.

Table 3.12 WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	3.6
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	7.7	2	13.3	3	10.7
Agree	8	51.5	10	66.7	18	64.3
Strongly Agree	3	23.1	3	20.0	6	21.4
Total	13	100	15	100	28	100

Table 3.13 WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	3	37.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	12.5
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Support for the Western Australian best practice in speed enforcement strategy

WA Police agreed that Model 3 is generally supportive of the strategy for best practice in speed enforcement proposed for WA. This belief was similarly expressed by the majority of Local Government respondents (62%) and ORSS (62.5%). This

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

sentiment was particularly strong among Local Governments in the urban area (78.6%) versus non-urban (46.7%) area.

Table 3.14 The proposed model generally supports the state strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	3.4
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	21.4	7	46.7	10	34.5
Agree	11	78.6	6	40.0	17	58.6
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	3.4
Total	14	100	15	100	29	100

Table 3.15 The proposed model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	5	62.5
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Preferred funding agencies for the proposed vehicle traffic count program

When asked who should fund the proposed vehicle traffic count program, WA Police indicated that Local Government should finance the program from their existing budget. This option was endorsed by 57% of urban and 13.3% of non-urban Local Governments and 24% of ORSS. Both Local Government (64.3% urban; 40% non-urban) and ORSS (33.3%) respondents also endorsed WA Treasury as a possible funding option. There was also some support from both Local Government and ORSS for Main Roads WA to fund the traffic count program. The least preferred funding option was a rate-payer funded community road safety levy.

Table 3.16 From the options listed, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program? Select as many as apply (Local Government respondents)

Options:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*
Local Government from existing budgets	8	57.1	2	13.3	10	34.5
WA Police	4	28.6	4	26.7	8	27.6
Main Roads Western Australia	3	21.4	4	26.7	7	24.1
WA Treasury via a cost-recovery program	9	64.3	6	40.0	15	51.7
Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy	1	7.1	1	6.7	2	6.9

*Percentage of *Urban* (n=14), *Non-Urban* (n=15) and *All Local Government respondents* (n=29) respondents to question

Additional comments provided by the Local Government respondents called for the Road Trauma Trust Account and monies from speeding fines to be used to fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program.

Table 3.17 From the options listed, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Options	n	%*
Local Government from existing budgets	3	24.0
WA Police	1	12.5
Main Roads Western Australia	3	24.0
WA Treasury via a cost-recovery program	4	33.3
Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy	2	25.0

Percentage of *all stakeholders* (n=8) that responded to the question

Additional comments provided by one ORSS respondent suggested that the Department of Local Government could alternatively fund the proposed traffic count program.

3.1.2.2 *WA Police Issues*

WA Police were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a number of statements directly relevant to their proposed involvement in Model 3.

WA Police expressed general *agreement* for the proposed partnership with Local Government detailed in Model 3. Despite this general support, WA Police were in fact *uncertain* of the following issues:

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- how much information they currently possessed about speeding on local area roads;
- whether Model 3 would necessitate a substantial increase in the overall number of hours of police enforcement of speeding;
- whether any required additional hours of enforcement under Model 3 could be provided under the proposed best practice strategy of speed enforcement for WA, and
- whether they had the financial resources required to deliver the enforcement of speeding on local area roads required under Model 3.

WA Police strongly indicated that it did *not* have the administrative capacity required to process the speed data information supplied by Local Government. Nevertheless, WA Police was supportive of the development of a:

- database that Local Government could use to upload speed data information for police, and a
- protocol to ensure that Local Government identified problem roads received sufficient speed enforcement.

3.1.2.3 Local Government issues

Local Government were similarly asked to indicate their level of agreement with a number of statements directly relevant to their proposed involvement in Model 3. Frequency counts of these responses by location of Local Government are presented in the following Tables.

Current supply of vehicle speed data to WA Police

Approximately four in 10 Local Government respondents considered they currently supplied WA Police with enough information about speeding to assist with enforcement on local area roads. Somewhat more non-urban (33%) than urban (23%) Local Governments considered they did not supply WA Police with enough information to assist enforcement.

Table 3.18 My Local Government already supplies WA Police with enough information about speeding on local area roads to assist with their enforcement activities

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	3	23.1	4	33.3	7	28.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	4	30.8	4	33.3	8	32.0
Agree	5	38.5	3	25.0	8	32.0
Strongly Agree	1	7.7	1	8.3	2	8.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Willingness to participate in a Model 3 partnership

Notwithstanding the above response, nearly eight in 10 Local Government respondents were supportive of a Model 3 partnership to provide information on speeding for use by WA Police, subject to an appropriate level of financing. Willingness to participate was noticeably stronger among urban Local Governments (46.2% *Strongly Agree*) compared with non-urban Local Governments (23.1% *Strongly Agree*).

Table 3.19 Subject to appropriate financing arrangements, my Local Government would be willing to participate in the proposed model to supply local area vehicle traffic speed data to WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	2	15.4	2	7.7
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	15.4	2	15.4	4	15.4
Agree	5	38.5	6	46.2	11	42.3
Strongly Agree	6	46.2	3	23.1	9	34.6
Total	13	100	13	100	26	100

Current versus proposed vehicle traffic counts

Only four (16%) of the respondent Local Governments -three urban and one non-urban- considered their current vehicle traffic count programs satisfied the number of counts proposed each year. Around eight in 10 non-urban and seven in 10 urban Local Governments indicated that their annual vehicle traffic counts would need to increase to meet the targets proposed under Model 3.

Table 3.20 Under the proposed model, my Local Government would need to increase the number of vehicle traffic counts it presently conducts each year

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	2	15.4	0	0.0	2	8.0
Disagree	1	7.7	1	8.3	2	8.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	7.7	1	8.3	2	8.0
Agree	6	46.2	9	75.0	15	60.0
Strongly Agree	3	23.1	1	8.3	4	16.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Appropriateness of the proposed vehicle traffic count program

Around one-third of all respondent Local Government considered that the proposed number of annual vehicle traffic counts (by size of Local Government) was ‘about right’. This proportion was considerably higher for urban (46.2%) versus non-urban (18.2%) Local Government respondents. Indeed, most respondent Local Governments, across urban (46.2%) and non-urban (45.5%), indicated the proposed number of vehicle counts was ‘excessive’. Around a third (36.4%) of non-urban Local Governments was undecided on the appropriateness of the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts.

Table 3.21 Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed number of annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?

Count number is:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
About Right	6	46.2	2	18.2	8	33.3
Excessive	6	46.2	5	45.5	11	45.8
Too Low	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Undecided	1	7.7	4	36.4	5	20.8
Total	13	100	11	100	24	100

A number of Local Government respondents provided additional comments about the proposed number of annual counts. For the most part these comments indicated the proposed number of counts was too high and could not be resourced. Half the number of counts was said to be more acceptable and manageable. It was commented that many local area roads would not require speed monitoring because of low traffic

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

volumes. One respondent suggested that Local Government traffic counts should ‘tie in’ with the count program conducted by Main Roads WA to avoid ‘double duty’.

Appropriateness of the estimated costs of the proposed vehicle traffic count program

As for the of the proposed number of vehicle traffic counts, the respondent Local Governments varied in their assessment of the appropriateness of the estimated cost of the proposed traffic count program. Urban Local Government respondents (38.5%) were more likely to consider the costs to be ‘about right’, compared with 18.2% of non-urban Local Governments. However, over half of the respondent non-urban Local Governments were undecided about the accuracy of the estimated costs.

Table 3.22 Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed costs of the annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?

Proposed costs are:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
About Right	5	38.5	2	18.2	7	29.2
Excessive	2	15.4	2	18.2	4	16.7
Too Low	4	30.8	1	9.1	5	20.8
Undecided	2	15.4	6	54.5	8	33.3
Total	13	100	11	100	24	100

Additional comments indicated that some Local Government respondents felt the proposed costs were an underestimate, while others indicated that the costs would not be an issue given their existing budgets for traffic counts or if Local Government were to be compensated for additional counts. One respondent was doubtful that the additional cost to Local Government could not be justified if police failed to provide a guarantee of additional enforcement on local area roads.

Personnel to undertake the proposed vehicle traffic counts

Nearly three-quarters of Local Government respondents indicated they did not currently employ sufficient personnel to cover the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts. Slightly more urban (77%) than non-urban 66.6%) agreed they lacked sufficient personnel for this task.

Table 3.23 My Local Government has sufficient personnel to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	5	38.5	4	33.3	9	36.0
Disagree	5	38.5	4	33.3	9	36.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	8.0
Agree	3	23.1	2	16.7	5	20.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Employment of sub-contractors for vehicle traffic counts

In response to the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts, around a third of Local Government respondents indicated they would look to employ a sub-contractor to meet their annual target, with urban Local Government respondents (46.2%) more likely than non-urban (16.6%) to endorse this option.

Table 3.24 My Local Government would look to employ a subcontractor to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	7.7	3	25.0	4	16.0
Disagree	2	15.4	5	41.7	7	28.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	4	30.8	2	16.7	6	24.0
Agree	4	30.8	1	8.3	5	20.0
Strongly Agree	2	15.4	1	8.3	3	12.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Financial resourcing

Around two-thirds of Local Government respondents indicated they did *not* have the financial resources required to undertake the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program. This proportion was highest for non-urban Local Government respondents (83.3%) compared with urban (53.9%) respondents.

Table 3.25 My Local Government does not have the financial resources required to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	7.7	1	8.3	2	8.0
Disagree	4	30.8	1	8.3	5	20.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	4.0
Agree	5	38.5	4	33.3	9	36.0
Strongly Agree	2	15.4	6	50.0	8	32.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Proposed partnerships with WA Police under a regional grouping arrangement

Despite the expressed lack of financial resources to undertake the proposed vehicle traffic count program, less than one in three respondent Local Governments indicated they were willing to be part of a regional grouping of Local Governments to partner with WA Police. Nearly four in 10 urban (38.5%) versus one in 10 non-urban (8.3%) Local Governments were opposed to joining a regional grouping of Local Governments to facilitate the partnership with WA Police. As a group, most Local Governments were in fact unsure about joining a regional grouping of Local Governments (48%).

Table 3.26 My Local Government would prefer to enter the proposed partnership with WA Police as part of a regional grouping of councils

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	5	38.5	1	8.3	6	24.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	5	38.5	7	58.3	12	48.0
Agree	2	15.4	4	33.3	6	24.0
Strongly Agree	1	7.7	0	50.0	1	4.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Support for the development of a database to upload vehicle speed data

Overall, around 75% of respondent Local Governments supported the creation of a database to upload speed data to WA Police. This support was strongest among urban (92.3%) versus non-urban (58.4%) Local Governments.

Table 3.27 My Local Government supports the idea of creating a database for the upload of vehicle traffic speed data for access by WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	1	7.7	1	8.3	2	8.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	4	33.3	4	16.0
Agree	8	61.5	5	41.7	13	52.0
Strongly Agree	4	30.8	2	16.7	6	24.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

Perceived community support for the partnership with WA Police

The vast majority of all respondent Local Governments (84%) indicated their local residents would not disapprove of their partnership with WA Police to assist the enforcement of speeding on local area roads. This belief was highest among urban (92.3%) than non-urban (75%) Local Governments.

Table 3.28 My Local Government believes local residents would not approve of the council providing police with information about speeding to assist local area enforcement

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	5	38.5	2	16.7	7	28.0
Disagree	7	53.8	7	58.3	14	56.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	3	25.0	3	12.0
Agree	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	4.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	13	100	12	100	25	100

3.1.2.4 Additional respondent comments

The main themes of additional, final comments from Local Government respondents about Model 3 are as follows:

- The supply of speed data by Local Government to WA Police is something that all Local Governments should strive to do if they want to improve policing of speeds on local roads, though it should not be a mandatory requirement.
- Local Governments do not have the resources to support the proposed (unrealistic) number of annual counts and would most likely 'fall short' in meeting the specified targets.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- Local Government should not have sole responsibility for identifying problem roads for speeding.
- Local Government should not be held responsible for managing drivers' (mis)use of the road, even though WA Police fail to see that speeding on local area roads is a priority for enforcement alongside those roads where fatalities occur.
- Failure by WA Police to provide speed enforcement on local area roads has contributed to large expenditure by Local Government on traffic calming devices which may impact on the travel of emergency vehicles and the level of traffic noise.
- The major issue for Local Governments is speed on District and Local Distributor roads plus some more significant access roads. Speeding in these locations is easy to identify and once identified should be part of WA Police's enforcement program.
- Police do not always provide a significant level of enforcement of speeding when provided with data on speeding and when asked to.
- It is questionable whether WA Police will be able to provide the required level of enforcement for identified roads and whether they will provide the necessary feedback about their activities on these identified roads.
- All initiatives that focus on *Towards Zero* strategies should get support from external funding sources, including the Model 3 initiatives to be undertaken by Local Government.
- Insufficient detail/evidence was provided to determine the 'value for money' of Model 3.
- WA Police could be granted access to Roman II (Road Management System) where it is supposed to archive Local Government traffic data.

The main themes of additional final comments provided by Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents about Model 3 are as follows:

- Model 3 travel speed data monitoring should be a non-mandatory extension of what already occurs to support Local Government funding applications for other road projects with the addition that all data is passed to WA Police.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- Local Government speed data should be provided to WA Police at a central and district level.
- How Local Government speed data is passed on to WA Police and stored is critical to the success of the proposal and is likely to require an initial capital cost.
- Local Government speed data should be ‘vetted’ by engineering/technical service staff to ensure the highest priority roads are identified for enforcement.
- Enforcement of speed limits on particular local area roads (eg. those bounding major hospitals, entertainment and sporting facilities) used by non-local resident drivers will not always reduce speeds on that road.
- Demands on Local Government and police time for mandatory data collection and mandatory speed enforcement would most likely outstrip available resources.
- The proposed high number of vehicle traffic counts could lead to increased vandalism of count equipment if the public become aware of the intended use of the data.
- More detail is required to judge the ‘value for money’ of the proposal.

3.1.3 Survey findings for Model 2

The survey findings for Model 2 are presented below and as for Model 3 are structured according to *common* (all three respondent groups) and *specific* issues (for Local Government and WA Police). Similarly, none of the findings have been tested for statistical significance due to the small number of respondents.

3.1.3.1 Common issues

Outsourcing of speed camera enforcement to Local Government

WA Police were strongly opposed to the outsourcing of speed camera enforcement to Local Government, irrespective of the ownership of the road. In contrast, one third of urban and around one in ten non-urban Local Government respondents disagreed that WA Police should exclude Local Government from undertaking camera based enforcement on their behalf. Half of ORSS respondents also disagreed with the exclusion of Local Government from camera based speed enforcement responsibilities on behalf of WA Police.

Table 3.29 WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under *any* circumstance (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	3	25.0	0	0.0	3	13.0
Disagree	1	8.3	1	9.1	2	8.7
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	8.3	4	36.4	5	21.7
Agree	4	33.3	2	18.2	6	26.1
Strongly Agree	3	25.0	4	36.4	7	30.4
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.30 WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under *any* circumstance (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	4	50.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	1	12.5
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100

Outsourcing of speed camera enforcement to Local Government for locally controlled roads only

When presented with the option of allowing Local Government to undertake a speed camera program only on roads they control, WA Police were less certain of their position (which is somewhat inconsistent with their previous comment). Indeed, compared with the previous model of unrestricted enforcement, slightly more support for an area restricted model of speed enforcement was found among urban Local Government respondents (41.7%) and non-urban respondents (18.2%) and ORSS (72.5%) respondents.

Table 3.31 Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding *only* on the local area roads it is directly responsible for (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	3	25.0	4	36.4	7	30.4
Disagree	3	25.0	3	27.3	6	26.1
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	8.3	2	18.2	3	13.0
Agree	3	25.0	0	0.0	3	13.0
Strongly Agree	2	16.7	2	18.2	4	17.4
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.32 Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding *only* on the local area roads it is directly responsible for (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	1	12.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	25.0
Agree	4	50.0
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Mandatory speed camera enforcement by Local Government

WA Police similarly endorsed the position that it should not be mandatory for Local Governments to undertake speed camera enforcement on their behalf. This position was endorsed by the majority of Local Government respondents across the urban (83.3%) and non-urban (80%) area and three-quarters of ORSS respondents.

Table 3.33 It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	2	16.7	2	20.0	4	18.2
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agree	4	33.3	1	10.0	5	22.7
Strongly Agree	6	50.0	7	70.0	13	59.1
Total	12	100	10	100	22	100

Table 3.34 It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	1	12.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	12.5
Agree	6	75.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Use of the Laser Technology Incorporated LTI TruCam for speed camera enforcement

Model 2 proposed that *if* Local Government were to undertake speed camera enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only do so using the LTI TruCam digital speed camera and in the ‘auto’ rather than ‘manual’ detect mode (thereby denying Local Government the opportunity to stop motorists to issue a Traffic Infringement Notice). WA Police strongly endorsed this proposal, as did the vast majority of Local Government respondents -irrespective of location- and ORSS respondents.

Table 3.35 If Local Government undertakes camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI TruCam in ‘automatic’ mode and not stop motorists to issue an infringement notice (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	16.7	2	18.2	4	17.4
Agree	3	25.0	2	18.2	5	21.7
Strongly Agree	7	58.3	7	63.6	14	60.9
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.36 If Local Government undertakes camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI Trucam in ‘automatic’ mode and not stop motorists to issue an infringement notice (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don’t Know	3	37.5
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	2	25.0
Total	8	100.0

Effect of Local Government speed camera enforcement on local area speeding

WA Police were unsure whether the outsourcing of a speed camera program to Local Government would help reduce speeding on local area roads. In contrast, around two-thirds of urban Local Governments and three quarters of ORSS respondents considered such a program would help reduce speeding on local area roads. Only one in 10 non-urban Local Government respondents considered the program would impact positively on local area speeding, with most (45.5%) being unsure of its impact.

Table 3.37 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	8.3	3	27.3	4	17.4
Disagree	2	16.7	2	18.2	4	17.4
Unsure/ Don’t Know	1	8.3	5	45.5	6	26.1
Agree	6	50.0	1	9.1	7	30.4
Strongly Agree	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	8.7
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.38 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding (Other Road Safety Stakeholders)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	12.5
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don’t Know	1	12.5
Agree	6	75.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100

Funding priority under the Toward Zero road safety strategy

WA Police did *not* consider the proposed outsourcing of speed camera enforcement to Local Government to be a funding priority under the *Toward Zero* strategy. This assessment was shared by a third of Local Government respondents and half of all ORSS respondents. Around 40% of these groups were however, unsure of the status of this proposal as support for the *Toward Zero* strategy.

Table 3.39 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is *not* a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	8.3	1	9.1	2	8.7
Disagree	2	16.7	1	9.1	3	13.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	5	41.7	4	36.4	9	39.1
Agree	4	33.3	3	27.3	7	30.4
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	8.7
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.40 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is *not* a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	1	12.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Support for the Western Australian best practice in speed enforcement strategy

WA Police were *uncertain* if the proposed outsourcing model for speed camera enforcement was supportive of the state's proposed strategy for best practice in speed enforcement. This assessment was similarly shared by two-thirds of urban and 45.5% of non-urban Local Government respondents and over a third of ORSS respondents. Fewer than four in 10 ORSS respondents and a quarter of urban Local Government respondents considered that the outsourcing of speed camera enforcement to Local Government would support the best practice strategy.

Table 3.41 The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	4	36.4	4	17.4
Disagree	1	8.3	2	18.2	3	13.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	8	66.7	5	45.5	13	56.5
Agree	3	25.0	0	0.0	3	13.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 3.42 The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	2	25.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	37.5
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Responsibility for the processing of digital images and the issue of Traffic Infringement Notices

WA Police supported the proposal that they retain full responsibility for the processing of digital images and the issue of Traffic Infringement Notices if they outsourced camera enforcement to Local Government. This position was also agreed to by most urban and non-urban Local Governments and ORSS.

Table 3.43 WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and the issue of infringement notices (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.3
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	4.3
Agree	2	16.7	2	18.2	4	17.4
Strongly Agree	9	75.0	8	72.7	17	73.9
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.44 WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and issue of infringement notices (Other Road Safety respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	2	25.0
Agree	4	50.0
Strongly Agree	2	25.0
Total	8	100.0

Value for money

WA Police were uncertain if the proposed model represented good value for money. In contrast, around a third of urban of Local Government respondents, 20% of non-urban Local Government respondents, and 37% of ORSS respondents considered that outsourcing speed camera enforcement to Local Government represented good value for money. Most other respondents were either undecided or considered the program did not represent good value for money.

Table 3.45 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money (Local Government respondents)

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	3	25.0	2	18.2	5	21.7
Disagree	2	16.7	4	36.4	6	26.1
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	25.0	3	27.3	6	26.1
Agree	3	25.0	2	18.2	5	21.7
Strongly Agree	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.3
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Table 3.46 The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	1	12.5
Unsure/ Don't Know	4	50.0
Agree	3	37.5
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Preferred options for the supply of speed camera equipment to Local Government

Survey respondents were presented with three options for the supply of camera equipment to Local Government (see Tables 3.47 and 3.48). None of the proposed options was endorsed by WA Police who instead reiterated their position that Local Government *should not* under any circumstances undertake camera based enforcement. Among the Local Government and ORSS respondents, the loan of a camera from WA Police was the most preferred option. Only three Local Government respondents indicated that Local Government should share in the purchase/lease and use of a camera via a regional grouping. Five Local Governments reiterated their objection to undertaking camera based enforcement, while another suggested that monetary penalties should be used to fund Local Government cameras.

Table 3.47 If your Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera for use? (Local Government respondents)

Options:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Loan one from WA Police at no cost	5	45.5	4	40.0	9	47.4
Purchase/ lease from the manufacturer for exclusive use and recoup the costs as required	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Purchase/ lease from the manufacturer as part of a regional grouping of Local Government and share the use and recoup the costs as required	2	18.2	1	12.5	3	15.8
Other	4	36.4	3	37.5	7	36.8
Total	11	100	8	100	19	100

A number of Local Government respondents provided additional comments on the funding of the purchase of speed cameras. Some respondents took the opportunity to reiterate their opposition to participating in the program. Others suggested that Local Government could recoup the cost from speeding infringement monies

Table 3.48 If Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera to Local Government for use? (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Options	n	%
Loan one from WA Police at no cost	4	57.1
Purchase/ lease from the manufacturer for exclusive use and recoup the costs as required	0	0.0
Purchase/ lease from the manufacturer as part of a regional grouping of Local Government and share the use and recoup the costs as required	2	28.6
Other	1	14.3
Total	7	100.0

Preferred funding bodies for the Local Government speed camera enforcement program

Though WA Police again reiterated their opposition to Model 2, they indicated that if such a program were to be undertaken Local Government should fund it from their existing budgets. Local Government and ORSS respondents instead nominated both WA Police and WA Treasury as potential funders of the program (Tables 3.49 and 3.50).

Table 3.49 Who do you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program component)? Select as many as apply (Local Government respondents)

Options:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*
Local Government from their existing budgets	3	21.4	0	0.0	3	10.3
WA Police	5	35.7	5	33.3	10	34.5
WA Treasury under a cost-recovery program	9	31.0	6	40.0	15	51.7
Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.4

*Percentage of *Urban* (n=14), *Non-Urban* (n=15) and *All Councils* (n=29) that responded to question

Table 3.50 Who do you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program)? *Select as many as apply* (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Options	n	%*
Local Government from their existing budgets	2	28.5
WA Police	3	42.9
WA Treasury under a cost-recovery program	3	42.9
Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy	2	28.5
Other	1	14.3

*Percentage of *Other Road Safety Stakeholders* (n=7) that responded to question

Two ORSS respondents also suggested that the proposed Local Government speed camera program could be paid for using speeding infringement monies and sponsored by road safety stakeholder organisations.

Preferred model of remunerating Local Government for undertaking a speed camera enforcement program

Survey respondents were presented with three possible models for the remuneration of Local Government for a speed camera enforcement program. WA Police again reiterated their opposition to Local Government conducting speed camera enforcement and thus did not nominate a preferred model of remuneration. Local Government respondents indicated a preference for being remunerated for all costs associated with each hour of enforcement and administration (Table 3.51), while ORSS respondents showed support for all three models of remuneration (Table 3.52).

Table 3.51 If camera based enforcement was outsourced, please indicate your preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service (Local Government respondents)

Options:	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Recovery of all costs for hours of camera operation and administration	7	63.6	2	25.0	9	47.4
Receive an agreed percentage of the monetary fine for each detected offence	0	0.0	2	25.0	2	10.5
Receive an annual grant to finance a specified number of hours of camera operation and administration	2	18.2	1	12.5	3	15.8
Other	2	18.2	3	37.5	5	26.3
Total	11	100	8	100	19	100

Table 3.52 If camera based enforcement was outsourced, please indicate your preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service (Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents)

Agreement	n	%*
Recovery of all costs for hours of camera operation and administration	2	25.0
Receive an agreed percentage of the monetary fine for each detected offence	2	25.0
Receive an annual grant to finance a specified number of hours of camera operation and administration	3	37.5
Other	1	12.5
Total	8	100

Number of hours of speed camera enforcement to be undertaken by Local Government

Local Government respondents were asked to estimate how many hours per day of speed camera enforcement they would be willing to undertake. Of the non-urban respondents, five reiterated their lack of support for Model 2 and thus indicated ‘zero’ hours. Another indicated it would depend on the level of resources required and funding provided, while another indicated it was ‘not possible to say as it had not been discussed’.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Among urban Local Government respondents, three respondents indicated a willingness to conduct between two and four hours per day. Other respondents indicated zero hours because they did not support Model 2, while others indicated it would depend on issues such as workloads, capacity and the level of funding provided.

Accuracy of the assumptions about Local Government costs associated with outsourcing the speed camera program

Local Government respondents were asked to comment on the accuracy of the Local Government costs associated with the proposed outsourcing of the camera program. Unfortunately only nine responses were provided. One respondent commented the costs seemed 'reasonable'; another commented the camera operator needed to be a technical person, not a Ranger, while another suggested the Ranger salary was too low. Other respondents indicated that other costs were an underestimate. Two respondents

3.1.3.2 Police issues

WA Police were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a number of statements directly relevant to their proposed involvement in Model 2 and how this model might be administered.

WA Police agreed that additional speed enforcement was required on lower speed, lower volume local area roads but disagreed, again, with the outsourcing of a speed camera enforcement program to Local Government. Police were also unsure whether outsourcing camera based enforcement to Local Government would necessarily reduce the number of hours of enforcement police would otherwise have to provide on local area roads.

WA Police were also opposed to:

- Local Government Rangers conducting the proposed speed camera based enforcement;
- the use of the LTI TruCam by Local Government for speed enforcement;

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- the development of an internet based system for the upload of digital images captured by Local Government, and
- the administration by WA Police of the internet based system for the uploading of digital images captured by Local Government.

WA Police also considered they do not have the required administrative resources to support the outsourcing program, nor do they have the financial resources required to process the digital images and issue the Traffic Infringement Notices generated by a Local Government camera enforcement program.

When asked to comment on the assumptions underlying the cost estimates, WA Police felt it would be inappropriate to comment on the costs detailed in the document without conducting their own extensive research and investigation of them. They did however, comment that based on current projects, the costing associated with development and purchase of software was significantly under-priced. No comment was provided by WA Police on the appropriateness of the assumptions used to estimate the revenue raised through outsourcing speed camera enforcement to Local Government.

3.1.3.3 Local Government issues

Local Government were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a number of statements directly relevant to their proposed involvement in Model 3. Frequency counts of these responses by location of Local Government are presented in the following Tables.

Need for additional enforcement of speeding on local area roads

Overall, nearly eight in ten Local Government respondents considered that additional enforcement of speeding was required on their local area roads. This belief was strongest among urban (100%) compared with non-urban (73%) Local Government respondents.

Table 3.53 My Local Government believes that *no* additional enforcement of speeding is required on its local area roads

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	5	41.7	4	36.4	9	39.1
Disagree	7	58.3	4	36.4	11	47.8
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	4.3
Agree	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	8.7
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Support for undertaking speed camera enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Despite most Local Governments believing that more speed enforcement is required on local area roads, around seven in 10 respondents did not support their Local Government undertaking speed camera enforcement on behalf of WA Police. Most other Local Government respondents were unsure of their support for this proposal.

Table 3.54 My Local Government is opposed to undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	1	8.3	1	9.1	2	8.7
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	25.0	2	18.2	5	21.7
Agree	5	41.7	4	36.4	9	39.1
Strongly Agree	3	25.0	4	36.4	7	30.4
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Undertaking speed camera enforcement as part of regional grouping of Local Governments

The majority of respondents reiterated their opposition to undertaking a camera enforcement program even when presented with the option of doing so as part of a regional grouping of Local Governments. The option was not however, as strongly rejected with most non-urban Local Governments (54.5%) being unsure of the proposal, while a quarter of urban Local Governments were in favour of the proposal.

Table 3.55 My Local Government would prefer to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police as part of a regional grouping of Local Governments

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	8.3	3	27.3	4	17.4
Disagree	5	41.7	2	18.2	7	30.4
Unsure/ Don't Know	3	25.0	6	54.5	9	39.1
Agree	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	8.7
Strongly Agree	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.3
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Use of Local Government Rangers as speed camera operators

None of the Local Government respondents supported the proposal of using their Rangers as speed camera operators. This opposition was consistent across urban (91.7%) and non-urban (90.9%) Local Governments.

Table 3.56 My Local Government does not support the use of Rangers to conduct the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	8.3	1	9.1	2	8.7
Agree	6	50.0	4	36.4	10	43.5
Strongly Agree	5	41.7	6	54.5	11	47.8
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Personnel to operate speed cameras

Following on from their unanimous rejection of using Rangers to operate speed cameras, the Local Government respondents were unanimous (100%) in their belief that they did not have sufficient employees to undertake camera enforcement duties.

Table 3.57 My Local Government does not currently have sufficient employees to work as camera operators to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Agree	5	41.7	4	36.4	9	39.1
Strongly Agree	7	58.3	7	63.6	14	60.9
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Administrative support the speed camera enforcement program

Local Government respondents were again reasonably united in their belief they did not have sufficient administrative resources to support the proposed camera enforcement program. Around nine in 10 urban and eight in 10 non-urban Local Governments acknowledged they lacked the required capacity to deal with the administration of the program.

Table 3.58 My Local Government has sufficient administrative capacity to support the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	5	41.7	6	54.5	11	47.8
Disagree	6	50.0	3	27.3	9	39.1
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	8.3	2	18.2	3	13.0
Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Financial compensation to undertake a speed camera enforcement program

Consistent with their expressed deficits to undertake the program operationally and administratively, nearly all respondents (95.7%) agreed their Local Government would require financial compensation to undertake the proposed camera based enforcement program.

Table 3.59 My Local Government would need to receive financial compensation to undertake the proposed camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.3
Agree	6	50.0	4	36.4	10	43.5
Strongly Agree	5	41.7	7	63.6	12	52.2
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Local resident support for a Local Government operated speed camera enforcement program

Around four in 10 urban and six in 10 non-urban Local Government respondents believed their local residents would not approve of them undertaking speed camera enforcement duties on behalf of WA Police. Most urban Local Governments respondents (41.7%) were unsure if their local residents would approve or disapprove, while only three respondents overall felt their local residents would approve of their camera enforcement duties.

Table 3.60 My Local Government believes that local residents would not approve of us undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	2	16.7	1	9.1	3	13.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unsure/ Don't Know	5	41.7	3	27.3	8	34.8
Agree	3	25.0	3	27.3	6	26.1
Strongly Agree	2	16.7	4	36.4	6	26.1
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

Determining the speed camera enforcement schedule

Urban and non-urban Local Government respondents varied in their support for sharing responsibility with WA Police in determining the weekly schedule for Local Government speed camera operation. Around six in 10 urban respondents considered this should be a shared responsibility compared with just over a third of non-urban respondents. Indeed most non-urban respondents (45.5%) were unsure whether the responsibility should be shared, while around 42% of urban respondents did not

support sharing this responsibility (and presumably preferred independent control over this).

Table 3.61 My Local Government believes that it should work with WA Police to jointly determine the weekly schedule of camera enforcement to be conducted by Local Government

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	8.3	2	18.2	3	13.0
Disagree	4	33.3	0	0.0	4	17.4
Unsure/ Don't Know	0	0.0	5	45.5	5	21.7
Agree	7	58.3	3	27.3	10	43.5
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	4.3
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

The development of an internet based system to upload digital camera images for access by WA Police

Most Local Government respondents (61%) were unsure of their support for an internet based system to upload digital camera images for processing by WA Police. Indeed four in 10 urban respondents disagreed with the proposal, while around one in five non-urban respondents disagreed with the proposal.

Table 3.62 My Local Government supports the idea of creating an internet based system for the upload of digital camera images it collects for processing by WA Police

Agreement	Respondent Council					
	Urban		Non-Urban		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Strongly Disagree	1	8.3	2	18.2	3	13.0
Disagree	4	33.3	0	0.0	4	17.4
Unsure/ Don't Know	6	50.0	8	72.7	14	60.9
Agree	1	8.3	1	9.1	2	8.7
Strongly Agree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	100	11	100	23	100

3.1.3.4 Additional respondent comments

The main themes and issues of the additional comments provided by Local Government respondents about Model 2 are as follows.

- Speed camera enforcement is the responsibility of WA Police and not the Local Government sector.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- Local Government should only participate in roadside speed camera activities if it is funded to do so as it does not have the funds to do so independently.
- Local Government and WA Police should work closely to determine sites for Local Government enforcement of speeding.
- Local Government involvement in roadside speed camera enforcement would increase the level of speed enforcement currently conducted in local area roads.
- Local Government participation in speed enforcement should be restricted to the supply of information about speeding on local area roads and not participate in road side camera operation.
- Local Government residents are likely to 'take issue' with their councils direct involve in roadside camera enforcement, just as they do for monitoring parking.
- What role would Local Government have in the resolution of disputes that may arise from the issue of a Traffic Infringement Notice (as per their role in the resolution of parking infringement disputes)?
- The 'boom' in the mining sector is likely to result in an exodus of employees from Local Government and therefore compromise the ability to undertake a Model 2 program.

The main themes and issues of the additional comments provided by Other Road Safety Stakeholder respondents about Model 2 are as follows.

- WA Police should remain the lead agency for traffic enforcement in the state.
- The systems and practices supporting Model 2 must be seen to be credible and not open to abuse or variation across Local Governments practices must be consistent and uniform.
- The imposition of a levy on ratepayers to fund Model 2 resources such as additional Rangers is likely to be met with resistance.
- Difficult to see how the proposed model would work well in small rural areas; it is likely to be an unpopular activity.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- Difficult to make judgements about ‘value for money’ without more detailed information.
- Generally supportive of the proposed strategy because it adds to enforcement on urban and rural local roads.
- WA Police should retain responsibility for the processing and issue of infringement issuing
- If Model 2 eventuates, Local Government should only operate the speed cameras in automatic mode and not stop motorists.
- Speed limits themselves need to be credible to support enforcement on local area roads.

3.1.4 Conclusions from the survey findings

The main aim of the on-line survey was to obtain feedback from the WA Local Government sector, WA Police, and other local road safety stakeholders on the viability and acceptance of the two proposed models of Local Government participation in the management of speed enforcement. The success of this task was unfortunately compromised by the low number (around one in five) of Local Government respondents, thus limiting the representativeness of the findings for this group.

In relation to Model 2, it is clear that WA Police do not support the outsourcing of a speed camera enforcement program to Local Government, whether it be for Local Government controlled roads or others. This opposition was similarly expressed by 59% and 55% respectively of urban and non-urban Local Government respondents. In contrast, most of the other road safety stakeholder respondents either supported the proposal or were at best unsure of its merits. This group of respondents would not however be directly involved in the implementation of the Model and as such their opinion carries less weight toward the viability of the option.

The opposition expressed by WA Police and the majority of Local Government respondents -the two main contributors to the proposed Model 2- strongly suggests that this model should be discarded. Without their support it would be extremely

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

difficult to develop the model further and achieve the ‘buy in’ required for this to be a viable enforcement option.

Survey respondents expressed a more positive view of Model 3. They considered the model would improve police’s understanding of the local area roads that required speed enforcement and that enforcement on these roads would reduce local area speeding. This outcome is central to the state’s *Toward Zero* road safety strategy. Further to this, the lead organisations for this model -Local Government and WA Police- indicated their willingness to form a partnership to respectively supply and receive information on speeding on local area roads.

Notwithstanding this generally positive view, aspects of the proposed model were not wholly supported. For example, many Local Government respondents considered that the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts was unnecessary and excessive and that they could not provide the resources required to meet these targets without financial assistance. The concerns expressed by WA Police about Model 3 related to the physical and financial resources required to process and review the speed data supplied by Local Government and to deliver the required additional hours of speed enforcement on identified local area roads.

3.1.4.1 Future direction

The survey findings were presented to the Project Steering Committee on 6th May 2011 with the aim of determining which of Model 2 or Model 3 should be selected for further development. Based on the findings there was unanimous support for the selection of Model 3 and the rejection of Model 2 due to lack of support expressed by WA Police and many Local Government respondents.

In relation to Model 3, members of the Project Steering Committee did however raise concerns over the:

- expressed inability of Local Government respondents to undertake the proposed number of vehicle traffic counts or even to maintain a traffic count program to facilitate the identification of problem roads for speeding; and,

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- WA Police's ability and/or commitment to provide follow-up enforcement on roads identified by Local Government.

Consequently, the Project Steering Committee determined that the future development of Model 3 should investigate these matters in the upcoming consultations with WA Police and Local Government.

3.2 Consultation with WA Police

Following the selection of Model 3 for further development, consultation was undertaken with WA Police to review their responses to this option, the proposal for processing Local Government speed data, and their enforcement response to the data.

The first consultation involved a meeting on the 7th June 2011 of the following:

1. Acting Assistant Commissioner Michelle Fyfe
Specialist Enforcement and Operations
2. Inspector Mark Ridley
Enhanced Speed Enforcement Program
State Traffic Operations
Specialist Services Division
3. Acting Superintendent Col Murray
State Traffic Operations
Specialist Services Division
(Member of the Project Steering Committee)
4. Jens Szirr
Project Manager
Enhanced Speed Enforcement Program
State Traffic Operations
Specialist Services Division
5. Mr Mal Shervill
Program Manager
Western Australian Local Government Association
(Program Manager and member of the Project Steering Committee)
6. Association Professor Brett Hughes
Director, C-MARC
(Member of the project research team)

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

7. Peter Palamara
Research Fellow, C-MARC
(Project leader and member of the Project Steering Committee)

The second consultation was a telephone interview conducted on the 23rd June with Inspector Mark Ridley and Senior Sergeant Tony Carabetta (Officer in Charge, Quality Control, Infringement Management Section, Specialist Services Division).

The third consultation was also a telephone interview conducted on the 28th June 2011 with First Class Constable Brian Smith, South Metropolitan Traffic Intelligence Officer.

The following is a summary of the issues and general agreements reached in the course of these consultations:

- WA Police affirmed their commitment to receive Metro Count generated travel speed data from WA Local Governments.
- Local Government should report the information on a monthly basis by email to the District Traffic Intelligence Officer who will in turn liaise with Infringement Management Operations.
- Microsoft Excel is the preferred format for the reporting of data.
- Excel spread sheet reporting should be standardised across Local Governments.
- Local Government should only provide speed data for locations where a minimum of 15% of recorded vehicles exceeded the posted speed limit.
- Locations should firstly receive engineering treatments, where possible.
- The speed data should be provided monthly and should include (but not be limited to) information of the following nature:
 - location and direction of count;
 - speed limit of location
 - period of count
 - number of vehicles counted;
 - descriptive information on vehicle speeds
 - proportion of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit by time of day and day of week.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- WA Police will assess each location forwarded by Local Government for its suitability for addition to the mobile camera deployment location database.
- Locations not suitable for mobile camera enforcement will be relayed to District Traffic Intelligence Office for possible ‘hand held’ digital laser enforcement; however, there is no guarantee of enforcement being undertaken at these locations.
- WA Police will not automatically provide feedback to Local Government about the enforcement provided to locations.
- Complaints about ‘hooning’ should be relayed to police via the on-line ‘hoon’ reporting form and not the proposed speed data reporting process.
- WA Police will assist with the development of information to advise Local Government of the contact details for their District Traffic Intelligence Officer and how to provide speed data to them.

3.3 Consultation with Local Government representatives

Telephone interviews were conducted with six Local Governments (see Table 3.63) that had participated in the Phase 3 on-line survey. The interviews were conducted to obtain feedback on the developments for Model 3 as per discussions with WA Police.

Table 3.63 Details of Local Governments interviewed in Phase 3

Local Government	Officer	Position
City of Stirling	Shane Pope	Road Safety Officer
City of Rockingham	Scott Lambie	Co-ordinator Traffic Services
City of Melville	Tiiu Stojanovic	Co-ordinator for Traffic and Road Safety
Town of Vincent	Craig Wilson	Manager Asset and Design Services
City of Greater Geraldton *	Neil Arbuthnot	Director of Community Infrastructure
City of Kalgoorlie/Boulder	Dean Wallis	Manager Engineering Services

*Newly formed Local Government combining Geraldton, Greenough, and Mullewa

The main issues for discussion with the Local Government officers were:

- their vehicle traffic count program in relation to the proposed speed data collection activities;

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- the data reporting criteria and data exchange processes recommended by WA Police;
- the speed enforcement response to Local Government data proposed by WA Police;
- the speed enforcement feedback processes proposed by WA Police; and
- any other issue or concern and recommendations for refining Model 3.

The following dot-points summarise the findings from these interviews:

- All Local Governments indicated their willingness to use their Metro Count vehicle traffic count data to identify local area roads where speeding is a problem to support targeted enforcement by WA Police.
- Notwithstanding their willingness to provide speed data to WA Police, Local Governments varied in their expressed ability to meet the vehicle count targets specified for Model 3.
- Local Governments that did not currently undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts expressed their willingness to increase their traffic counts if they could obtain financial assistance to do so.
- Most Local Governments agreed with the recommendation that speed data be provided on a monthly basis, though two Local Governments suggested this should occur at least fortnightly to enable a more timely response to the problem.
- All Local Governments agreed with the criteria set by WA Police to report only those locations where a minimum of 15% of recorded vehicles were exceeding the post speed limit.
- Local Government accepted the proposition that speed data should be provided to WA Police using Microsoft Excel and a standardised set of reporting variables.
- Local Government accepted that 'hoon' related speeding concerns should be relayed to the WA Police via their webpage for 'hoon' complaints and not through the Model 3 process.
- Local Government were accepting of the proposal to forward speed data to their District Traffic Intelligence Officer, who would in turn:

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- forward to Infringement Management Operations (State Traffic Operations) those locations that appear most suitable for addition to the mobile speed camera deployment location database; and
- retain those locations that are more suitable for hand-held digital laser enforcement by district police.
- Local Government interviewees expressed concern over the potential lengthy delay (four weeks or more) in the deployment of a mobile speed camera to a location once it has been added to the deployment locations database (unless the location has been manually selected for priority enforcement).
- Interviewees also expressed concern about the absence of a guarantee from WA Police to provide enforcement on local area roads where speeding is a problem but are deemed unsuitable for Vitronic speed camera enforcement.
- A major concern for interviewees is that WA Police would not, unless specifically requested to do so, routinely provide feedback to Local Government about the enforcement undertaken on identified problem roads.
- Most interviewees stated their enthusiasm for providing speed data to WA Police would lessen if it became apparent that follow-up enforcement was not being provided or they failed to receive adequate feedback on what enforcement had been undertaken (a number of the interviewees stated that in the past police had infrequently and unsystematically provided feedback following requests for speed enforcement).
- Local Government emphasised the importance under Model 3 of establishing a close working relationship with local police to expedite their requests for speed enforcement (which is currently the case for a number of Local Governments who supply speed data to District police for enforcement).

In conclusion, the main issues for Local Government regarding a Model 3 arrangement were:

- their ability to undertake an expanded vehicle traffic count program to best inform police of local area roads requiring speed enforcement;
- the timeliness, type and intensity of enforcement that would follow;

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- the importance of developing a communication strategy that especially provides timely feedback on the enforcement outcomes for locations submitted to police;
- being able to justify the use of council resources to participate in a Model 3 arrangement; and
- policies and practices are developed and supported to provide some ‘formality’ to the Model 3 partnership with WA Police; otherwise there is the fear the ‘partnership’ will revert to the informal, non-binding arrangement that characterises the present relationship with police.

4. PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN WA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND WA POLICE FOR THE SUPPLY AND USE OF LOCAL AREA SPEED DATA FOR TARGETED ENFORCEMENT

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a general framework for a partnership between Local Government and WA Police for the supply and use of local area speed data for strategic enforcement. *It should be noted that the framework does not obligate either organisation nor does it reflect the final form or all processes for the partnership. The intention of the framework is to provide a foundation for further dialogue between Local Government and WA Police.*

Included in the framework is an outline of the proposed roles and responsibilities of Local Government and WA Police, as well as a discussion of recommended processes to facilitate and support an accountable, effective partnership. This can only be achieved if:

- there is a shared understanding of the aims and objectives of the partnership;
- a shared understanding and acceptance of the respective roles and responsibilities of the partners;
- there are processes to ensure that quality data is provided in a timely manner;
- appropriate mechanisms are established to monitor and evaluate the performance of the partnership; and
- a clear communication strategy is developed for the contributing parties.

To achieve the above, the framework presented below builds on the Model 3 partnership proposed during Phase Two using the findings from the consultations in Phase Three with both parties.

The process to date has established that Local Government respondents and WA Police share an understanding of the merit of their respective roles in the partnership and the merit of the partnership to the state's road safety strategy. Local Government manages nearly 90% of the Western Australia road network and regularly undertakes vehicle traffic counts on many of its local roads to determine travel speeds as well as other traffic information. Local Government therefore understands the nature of speeding on these roads and is concerned with the risk speeding presents to its local

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

residents. The availability of this information places Local Government in a strong position to add to the intelligence base WA Police use to strategically target speeding motorists.

Partnering with organisations such as Local Government for strategic enforcement also aligns with police's recently announced *Road Policing Strategy 2011-2014*. The supply of intelligence on speeding by Local Government supports the stated roles and responsibilities of WA Police to:

- collect and disseminate intelligence to policing districts;
- increasingly use intelligence-led road policing strategies and technologies for deterrence and enforcement;
- deter and disrupt unlawful activity on the road network; and
- manage and coordinate the deployment of speed cameras.

The proposed partnership has the capacity to assist with the strategic enforcement of speeding and subsequently reduce local area speeding. These outcomes are fundamental to the state's Speed Enforcement Strategy and the associated development of strategies for best practice in speed enforcement for Western Australia (see Cameron, 2008) and the State's *Toward Zero* road safety strategy 2008-2020.

There are nevertheless a number of potential drawbacks to the proposed partnership. In the course of the project activities Local Government was presented with a number of opportunities to voice their opinions on the potential role of the sector in speed enforcement management. Unfortunately however, the majority of the sector did not embrace this opportunity. This could be interpreted as a measure of their disinterest in speeding as a problem on their local area roads (as opposed to speeding not being a problem). The effect of this could be that very few Local Governments may seek to partner with police to target speeding on local area roads. If so, this will undermine the intent and purpose of the proposed partnership to establish a sector-wide approach to the provision of contemporary information on speeding on local area roads to enhance the strategic enforcement of speeding by police. For this

reason then, Local Government should be provided with appropriate incentives to ‘trial’ the partnership program.

Consultation with WA Police has also noted their concerns, particularly over the resourcing implications of the proposed partnership. Police have indicated they do not necessarily have the administrative and financial resources required to process the anticipated volume of speed data provided by Local Government or to provide additional hours of enforcement. Without the commitment of police to the partnership and without the ability to provide follow-up enforcement, Local Government is also unlikely to maintain their commitment to the partnership. Funding suggestions are provided below to ensure the roles of Local Government and WA Police are financially sustainable.

4.2 Aim and objectives of the partnership model

The aim of partnership is to establish a formalised, sector-wide framework for the collection of contemporary local area roads travel speed data by Local Government and the provision of this information to and use by WA Police to support the strategic enforcement of speeding.

The specific objectives of the partnership are to:

- improve the quantity and quality of vehicle traffic speed data collected by Local Governments;
- provide guidelines for the supply of local area vehicle speed data by participating Local Governments to WA Police and police’s processing of the data;
- provide guidelines for the use of vehicle speed data by WA Police in their speed enforcement activities; and the
- implementation of strategies to aid communication and accountability within the partnership.

4.3 Collection of vehicle travel speed data by Local Government

The Phase Two draft of this model categorised Local Government into small, medium and large according to length of sealed and unsealed road within their

jurisdiction. This was done for the purpose of proposing the number of annual vehicle traffic counts to be undertaken. The responses to the Phase Three survey questions about the proposed number of counts and their cost showed that many Local Governments, particularly those in the non-urban areas, would need to increase their annual count to meet the proposed quota, which they could not afford to do. Furthermore, nearly half of urban and non-urban respondents felt the proposed quota was too high. Half the number of counts was said to be more acceptable. This recommendation has been adopted for the medium and small sized Local Governments but not the larger Local Governments who appear to be currently meeting the proposed target of 15 counts per week over 40 weeks (see Table 4.1). As per the opinion expressed by Local Government in Phase Three, the proposed number of counts is recommended and not mandatory.

Table 4.1 Weekly and annual traffic count targets by Local Government classification

Council Category	Weekly counts	Annual counts (40 weeks)
Small	2.5	100
Medium	5	200
Large	15	600

Acknowledging the recommendation of Phase Three Local Government respondents, it is recommended that every road be ‘counted’ a minimum of every three years. Respondent Local Governments indicated that their traffic count programs should also take into account which roads have been ‘counted’ or intended to be ‘counted’ by Main Roads WA (who undertake annual traffic counts and supply relevant data on speeding to WA Police for use) to avoid duplication of information.

Bearing in mind the locations that have been or will be ‘counted’ by MRWA, Local Government would be expected to allocate a proportion of annual counts per road type in accord with a number of criteria, including the percentage of road type within their local area; previously identified areas of speeding and crash occurrence; and complaints about speeding from residents. This will provide timely data on speeding across a *broad range of road types* that police can potentially allocate range of enforcement measures to (e.g., mobile Vitronic speed cameras and hand-held digital lasers operated by District officers)

4.4 Potential cost of the collection of vehicle travel speed data

The Phase Three Local Government respondents varied in their response to the estimated cost of conducting the proposed vehicle traffic count program. This was because Local Governments varied in their methods used to conduct their counts (i.e., in-house versus outsourced) and the relevant employment awards of Local Government personnel undertaking the counts and providing administrative assistance to the program. The original cost parameters have been retained and total *estimated* cost adjusted for a reduced number of counts and administrative time where appropriate. This has been done because the Phase Three responses to the calculated costs were so varied and it was not possible to establish a more representative cost (due to the limited number of Local Government respondents).

The revised estimated cost of the vehicle traffic count program has been based on the charges originally specified by Traffic Logistics Australia for each count. The charge per count varies between \$95 (if TLA uses the council's equipment) and \$135 (if TLA uses their own equipment), with an average cost of \$115. Based on this information the upper and lower and average cost per annum for the *number of counts* specified for each Local Government grouping is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Range and average annual cost of vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification

Council Category	Range of Cost of Counts (\$)	Average Cost Per Annum (\$)
Small	9,500-13,500	11,500
Medium	19,000-27,000	23,000
Large	57,000-81,000	69,000

Local Governments would be expected to support the vehicle traffic count program with an appropriate level of administration to:

- co-ordinate and monitor their in-house travel count activities, including the liaison with outside contractors if used;
- prepare vehicle travel count reports or alternatively interpret the reports prepared by outside contractors;
- prepare the necessary Microsoft Excel reports on identified locations for speeding to forward to WA Police; and to
- attend quarterly meetings with WA Police District Traffic Intelligence Officers.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Conversations with Local Government respondents have indicated that the original estimate of the number of hours of administration was too low, as was the cost per hour. Consequently, the number of hours of administration has been doubled (despite a reduction in the number of counts for some Local Governments) and the hourly charge increased by 20% to provide a more comfortable estimate of this cost.

Table 4.3 Annual administrative hours and associated costs for vehicle traffic counts by Local Government classification

Council Category	Annual Hours of Administration	Annual Cost (\$) (@ \$38.29 per hour)
Small	160	6,126.40
Medium	240	9,189.60
Large	320	12,252.80

Together, Tables 4.2 and 4.3 provide indicative costs for undertaking and administering the annual program of vehicle traffic counts. These figures are indicative because they are based on an assumption of the number of weekly counts that a council of a given size *could* conduct, and secondly, because individual councils may opt to use their own staff and equipment to conduct their traffic count program, which may be cheaper or more expensive than the costings based on the TLA charges. The estimated costs do not necessarily mean additional costs to Local Government as many are already budgeting for these charges to lesser and greater extents.

4.5 Processes for the supply of vehicle travel speed data to WA Police

The following processes describe how Local Government will provide police with the relevant information.

WA Police have indicated that the partnership model should focus exclusively on those local area roads where Local Government has identified that *at least 15% of recorded vehicles are exceeding the speed limit* and that other initiatives, such as traffic calming treatments, have either been applied or are deemed unsuitable for use. The partnership model is not intended to process complaints about ‘hoon’ related activity unless or until the road in question has been monitored and documented for

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

excessive speeding. Otherwise, the complaint about 'hoon' activity should be reported via the WA Police website report form.

Data on local area roads where speeding has been identified to be problem should be provided to WA Police in *Microsoft Excel* format on a *monthly* basis. The file shall contain information on the:

- location of the site;
- direction of the count;
- duration of the count;
- posted speed limit;
- number of vehicles counted
- minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation of speeds; and
- percentage of vehicles and number exceeding the speed limit and mean exceeding speed by time of day, day of week, and speed bin (in 10km/h intervals)

WA Police have requested that the information on speeding be kept relatively simple and brief for ease of processing but detailed enough to understand the most appropriate time(s) of day and day(s) of week for enforcement. Other relevant information such as the proximity of the site to shopping areas, school zones, hospitals and the like should be provided.

The file should be emailed (using the automated reply function) to WA Police District Office within the Local Government jurisdiction for the attention of the Traffic Intelligence Officer. It is recommended that a District Office email account be used, rather than the Traffic Intelligence Officer's personal email account, to ensure continuity in the Officer's absence. Clearing and responding to the email would be required under the Traffic Intelligence Officer's statement of duties.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

The above process can be used by individual Local Governments or by a regional grouping of Local Governments if a more co-ordinated response to regional speeding is required. This may be a more suitable arrangement in the non-urban and remote areas of Western Australia where resources are limited and are allocated on a priority basis.

Local Government would be expected to maintain a central database of locations forwarded to police for possible enforcement. This database could be maintained in Microsoft Excel or Access and updated with information from police about their response to the request and follow-up enforcement information. A database of this nature could be used to conduct both a process and outcome evaluation for Local Government on the usefulness and efficacy of the partnership.

4.6 Processes for the response by WA Police to speed data provided by Local Government

The use of the automated reply function will immediately inform Local Government that their submission has been received, though not acted on, by police.

Upon receipt of the submission of locations for enforcement, the District Traffic Intelligence Officer would be expected to make an initial judgement about the suitability of the location for Vitronic mobile speed camera enforcement. Locations that are thought to be suitable will be forwarded to Infringement Management Operations (IMO), State Traffic Operations, to be further considered for inclusion in the deployment locations database. Locations that are initially deemed to be *unsuitable* for Vitronic mobile speed camera enforcement should be considered for District traffic enforcement operation using hand-held digital lasers. At this point the District Traffic Intelligence Officer should advise Local Government within 14 days of submission which locations have been forwarded for further review and which have been held over at the District level for potential follow-up enforcement. Enforcement at these locations cannot be guaranteed.

The IMO staff will make the final decision on the suitability of the location for camera enforcement. The IMO will initially cross-check the location against the current deployment location database. If the site has not been previously added, IMO

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

staff (or relevant staff) will then undertake a physical examination of the location (taking into account issues such as the physical features of the location etc.) to ensure its suitability. This assessment should be completed and follow-up notification given to the District Traffic Intelligence Officer within 28 days of receipt of the location file. The District Intelligence Officer should then advise the submitting Local Government officer of the assessment within a further five working days.

Locations that are suitable for Vitronic speed camera enforcement will be added to the deployment locations database and subject to random selection for enforcement. Because it may take four weeks or longer for the location to be selected for enforcement, Local Government can apply to the IMO to have the location manually added to the deployment roster for more timely enforcement if they consider the site to be 'high risk'.

It is expected that during negotiations to implement the partnership model WA Police and Local Government will consider an abiding protocol for the frequency and intensity of enforcement on identified local area road. This will help establish process and performance indicators for the partnerships upon which to judge the success of the model.

Other than the advices and notifications detailed above, WA Police will not automatically advise either the District Traffic Intelligence Officer or the Local Government in question of the enforcement outcomes for a location that has been added to the deployment locations database. To receive such notification Local Government will need to contact their District Traffic Intelligence Officer.

4.7 District area meetings to support the partnership program

Local Government, particularly those in the non-urban areas, have stressed the importance of developing and maintaining a strong relationship with their District Traffic Intelligence Officer (or equivalent) to support safety on local area roads. To assist with this, it is recommended that a meeting be organised every quarter of Local Government representatives, the District Traffic Intelligence Officer, and other

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

District police representatives as necessary. The meeting is intended to provide both WA Police and Local Government with an opportunity to:

- review the partnership processes and activities in the preceding quarter;
- exchange information and ideas on the partnership process; and
- provide Local Government with a broad understanding of the enforcement activity and outcomes for the district in the previous quarter.

These meetings could be coordinated with those undertaken by the local area *RoadWise* road safety working group/committee.

4.8 Internet based resource to support the partnership program

It is recommended that the Western Australian Local Government Association and WA Police collaborate to develop a website for the partnership program. The website is intended to be a repository of information for Local Government to assist their participation in the program. It is expected the site would contain information such as the following:

- contact details (telephone number, location, email address) for all WA Police District Traffic Intelligence Officers (or equivalent);
- aims and objectives of the partnership program;
- criteria for the request of roads to receive enforcement;
- details of the speed data to be provided (including a Microsoft Excel workbook sample of data for download) and how and when it is to be provided;
- general details of the processes undertaken by police to review speed data;
- general information on how to make relevant requests of police;
- general information on the District Area meeting program;
- links to relevant resources and sites, including:
 - the WA Police on-line Hoon Activity report form, and
 - sources of funding to support their involvement in the partnership program.
- relevant documents from this project.

It is recommended that the webpage be administered and hosted by the WA Local Government Association.

4.9 Funding opportunities to support the partnership program activities of the Local Government and WA Police

WA Police and some Local Governments have expressed concerns regarding a lack of resources and finances to support their contribution to aspects of the partnership program. The following funding suggestions are provided to support their respective contributions.

Some Local Governments, particularly the larger metropolitan councils, are already committed to a vehicle traffic count program of the proposed size so there will be minimal additional cost for these councils to contribute to the program. For those Local Governments whose vehicle traffic count programs are under-developed or resourced, funds should be provided to assist their participation in the partnership for a 24 month period.

Recently announced changes to the level of funding flowing to the Road Trauma Trust Account from camera based traffic offences (increasing to 100% by July 2012) increases the possibility that funds from this program may be allocated to support Local Governments, upon application, to increase their vehicles traffic counts and to administer their contribution to the partnership. These additional funds could be provided to the WALGA *RoadWise* community road safety program which receives on-going funding from the Road Trauma Trust Account. *RoadWise* could establish and administer the funding program as per their Community Road Safety Grant Scheme.

Similarly, increased funding to the Road Trauma Trust Account could support WA Police to undertake additional enforcement via Strategic Traffic Enforcement Program funding. Other funds to support police's administration of the speed data obtained from Local Government and to process the increased number of images and infringements could be provided through an increased operating budget for police. This would need to be approved by State Treasury upon application by WA Police.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are provided to progress the proposed partnership between the Western Australian Local Government sector and WA Police.

1. Present the proposed partnership model to the Western Australian Local Government State Council for consideration

It is recommended that the President of the Western Australian Local Government Association in his capacity as Chair of the State Council present the proposed partnership model to the State Council for consideration. This process will enable the 17 Local Government zones of the State Council to indicate whether they:

- accept the partnership as proposed and wish the WA Local Government to commence negotiations with WA Police;
- accept the partnership ‘in principle’ but with recommended changes; or
- reject the proposed partnership model and the formal involvement of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

2. Establish a Partnership Implementation Committee if the proposed partnership model is accepted by State Council (with or without recommended changes)

Upon acceptance of the proposed partnership model by State Council, it is recommended that WALGA form a committee that is responsible for:

- the refinement and integration of any recommended changes to the model;
- making formal application to the Commissioner of WA Police to establish the partnership;
- on-going negotiation with the WA Police to implement the partnership model, including the development of all webpage resources; and
- liaison with relevant State Government agencies to establish appropriate sources of funding to support the partnership.

The Committee should be chaired by the existing WALGA *Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project Officer* with membership from both urban and non-urban Local Government and the *RoadWise* program.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

3. *Preparation and release of a media statement*

Following the State Council's response to the proposal, it is recommended that WALGA through its President draft and release a media statement outlining the findings of the project and WALGA's response.

REFERENCES

- Cameron, M. (2008). *Development of strategies for best practice in speed enforcement in Western Australia: Supplementary report* (No. 277). Victoria: Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC).
- Cameron, M., & Delaney, A. (2006). *Development of strategies for best practice in speed enforcement in Western Australia: Final report* (No. 270). Victoria: Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC).
- Palamara, P.; Jones, J.; Hildebrand, J.; & Langford, J. (2011). *Local Government enhanced speed enforcement management project: Phase One*. Perth Western Australia: Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (C-MARC) RR 10-001.
- Radalj, T., & Sultana, S. (2009). *Driver Speed Behaviours on Western Australian Road Network 2000, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007 and 2008*. Perth, Western Australia: Main Roads WA, Office of Road Safety.

APPENDIX A

Email invitation to Western Australian Local Government members inviting their participation in the Phase Two workshop

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Dear Colleagues

I am writing to invite you to participate in a workshop on **Wednesday 4th August 2010, 10.00am-2.00pm at Main Roads Western Australia (Waterloo Cres. East Perth), Level Two** conference room, to discuss the possible role(s) of Western Australian Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

The workshop is the second activity in a program of research into Local Government and speed enforcement management being undertaken by the Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (CMARC) under commission from the Western Australian Local Government Association. Some of you have already contributed to an earlier activity in which you completed an 'on-line' survey of your council's speed management activities and attitudes toward a number of proposed speed enforcement activities. The findings from that survey and other work conducted by CMARC will form the basis of a series of activities in the upcoming workshop.

The main objective of the upcoming workshop is to get further feedback from Local Government in Western Australia on a number of possible models or options for their involvement in speed enforcement management. The workshop will:

- Present an overview of the aims and objectives of the project;
- Detail the findings from the project activities undertaken so far and form these findings into a number of models or options for speed enforcement management for Local Government
- Provide an opportunity for Local Government participants to provide feedback on the acceptability, viability and potential (physical and financial) management of the proposed models or options of Local Government speed enforcement, and consequently
- Help refine the nature of the models or options for wider endorsement by Local Government and other speed enforcement management stakeholders.

We would very much welcome your participation in the upcoming workshop. Prior to your attendance we will forward some documentation to you on the project and the models/options of Local Government speed enforcement management to be considered. We will also present a series of questions for your council to consider prior to your attendance.

Please note that we will provide a light lunch. Metered parking is available on Waterloos Crescent.

Please RSVP your attendance to this email address by **WEDNESDAY 28TH JULY**. Participant numbers may need to be limited so please respond early.

We look forward to your attendance.

Peter Palamara

Research Fellow | Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre | School of Public Health

Curtin University of Technology | GPO Box U1987 | Perth | Western Australia 6845

Telephone +61 8 9266 2304 | Facsimile +61 8 9266 2958 | Mobile 041 222 8510

Email p.palamara@curtin.edu.au

APPENDIX B

August 4th (2011) Local Government Phase 2 workshop briefing document

WALGA Speed Enforcement Management Project

Phase Two Workshop Document

Wednesday 4th August 10.00-2.00pm

Main Roads Western Australia, East Perth

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide:

- background information on the WALGA Speed Enforcement Management Project;
- relevant findings from *Phase One* activities of the research program;
- an outline of the preliminary conceptual models for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management, and
- guideline questions to help you consider the models' relevance, merits and difficulties from the point of view of your council and broader road safety perspective.

The preliminary conceptual models are based on a review of the international literature on the involvement of Local Government in speed enforcement management and are the primary focus of the *Phase Two* plan of work workshop. As Local Government officers and Councillors, you are being asked to critically discuss the merits of the models on a number of levels to help determine which model (or models) is worthy of *further development and refinement*. To assist with this review process the findings of a survey of Western Australian Local Government is also presented here in summary form. These findings, plus other additional information, will provide you with material on the capabilities, resources, activities and attitudes of Local Government relevant to the conceptual models.

Before attending the workshop we strongly encourage you to read the entire document to obtain an overview of the project and an understanding of why the proposed models of Local Government speed enforcement management (Section 4, page 13-15) are being presented for discussion. We particularly encourage you to read the section on the proposed models and give some thought to their merit and relevance (to your council) prior to participating in the workshop.

2. Project Background

The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) has called for a feasibility study to document the potential role(s) for Local Government in speed enforcement

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

management. The resulting study, known as the *Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project*, is aligned with the State's *Toward Zero* road safety strategy 2008-2010 and relates to action under two of the strategy's cornerstones: Safe Road Use and Safe Speed. More specifically, the project relates to two of the Action Plan responsibilities for WALGA under *Toward Zero*, namely to:

- Investigate opportunities for Local Government to undertake enforcement activities (such as speed enforcement on local roads) [p. 11], and
- Research the role that Local Government can play in speed enforcement including sharing local traffic data with WA Police to allow targeted local enforcement [p. 18].

(Toward Zero-Recommended Implementation Plan 2009-2001, August 2008)

Considering a role for Local Government in speed enforcement has some precedence as it once played a central role in traffic control throughout Western Australia (Department of Local Government, 1981). The Traffic Act of 1919 effectively gave councils responsibility for the control of traffic, including the promulgation and enforcement of local traffic by-laws, including speeding. This arrangement remained until the amendment of the Traffic Act in 1974 and the creation of the centralised Road Traffic Authority. From this date the Western Australian police have assumed centralised responsibility for the enforcement of traffic laws across the state (Department of Local Government, 1981).

Nowadays Local Government is financially responsible for (with support from State and Federal Governments) and manages approximately 88% of the total state road network (MainRoads Western Australia, n.d.). The importance of this responsibility is underscored by the fact that 48% of crashes in Western Australia in 2006 resulting in death or hospitalisation (i.e., serious injury) occurred on roads with speed zones up to 70km/h (Marchant et al., 2006), roads which are typically, but not in all cases, managed by Local Government. Further to this, 46% of fatal crashes and 53% of hospitalisation crashes in 2006 where speed was judged by attending police to be a contributing factor occurred in speed zones up to 70km/h (Marchant et al., 2006). Clearly, crashes, injury and speeding are a problem on local area roads, which begs the question whether Local Government should or could participate in other road user behaviour management strategies, such as enforcement, in addition to their current use of traffic calming engineering initiatives on local area roads.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Of the many speed management initiatives, enforcement has long been considered a necessary and effective countermeasure to reduce or slow vehicle speeds (Wilson et al., 2009). In recent years the most substantial development in the enforcement of speeding to deter motorists has been the advent of automated camera based measures. The most recent review of the many evaluations of camera based speed enforcement programs concluded that speed enforcement detection devices are a “..promising intervention for reducing the number of road fatalities and deaths” (Wilson et al., 2009, p 2). Consequently, camera enforcement plays a central role in the conceptual models for Local Government speed enforcement management to be considered in this project.

As road network owners and managers, Local Government has a detailed understanding of its roads and a critical interest in their management to improve road safety for the benefit of local communities. Nationally, Local Government recognises the important role it can take in reducing road deaths and serious injuries on local roads, and similarly the applicability of the principles of Safe Systems to this end (Australian Local Government Association, 2009). At the national level Local Government accepts that road safety is a ‘core deliverable’ but this must be understood and appropriately financed against a background of increasing demands on Local Government for the delivery of a variety of services and the need to be financially sustainable (Australian Local Government Association, 2009).

The realisation of Western Australia’s Local Government commitment to road safety is similarly plagued by concerns of ‘sustainability’ in regards to finances and the attraction and retention of appropriately skilled workers. Not so surprisingly, the Systemic Sustainability Study undertaken by WALGA (2008) noted the practicalities of Local Government amalgamations and/or regional ‘pooled’ arrangement for staff, administrative services, and ‘whole of regional’ infrastructure services among other initiatives as a means to achieve ‘sustainability’ (WALGA, 2008). It is against this dynamic local government climate and landscape that Local Government must decide *if* and *how* it can undertake a greater role in speed enforcement management. The State’s road safety stakeholders must correspondingly consider if and how Local Government’s participation in speed enforcement management threatens or enhances both the quantity and quality of enforcement and to what extent it is prepared to support Local Government in this endeavour. These are some of the broader issues to be addressed in this project.

2.1 Project Aim, Framework and Objectives

The overall aim of the project is to develop one or more conceptual models for the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management in Western Australia.

The work and the outcomes are required to be

- based on the delivery of positive road safety outcomes;
- representative of best practice in speed enforcement;
- linked with the State Government Speed Enforcement Strategy;
- underpinned by a sustainable financial model; and
- cognisant of the proposed regional model of Local Government for service delivery as outlined in *The Journey: Sustainability into the Future, Shaping the Future of Local Government in Western Australia*.

The project consists of four distinct phases of work outlined below:

Phase One

To document the current and potential role of Local Government in the enforcement of speed limits and the broader relationship between Western Australian Local Government and other speed management and enforcement stakeholders in Western Australia.

Phase Two

To develop a number of interim options or models for the involvement of Western Australia Local Government in speed enforcement management.

Phase Three

To consult with Western Australian Local Governments, State Government stakeholders and agencies, and Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) to obtain feedback on these speed enforcement management models.

Phase Four

To provide a final set of recommendations for a preferred model (or models), based on the outcomes of Phases 2 and 3.

2.1.1 Phase One Research Issues and Methods

The following three activities were undertaken to collate the required background information to assist with the development of interim models of Local Government participation in speed enforcement management.

- A) The identification, retrieval and critical review of relevant local, national and international literature on Local Government enforcement of speed limits.

A variety of transport literature databases and known transport/road safety related internet sites were interrogated to identify relevant local, national and international published literature on the role of Local Government in the speed enforcement management. In addition to this, project staff liaised with selected contacts to investigate the speed enforcement management activities elsewhere in the world and relevant documentation. This was restricted to the following countries: the United Kingdom, USA, Canada, Sweden, Norway, and New Zealand.

- B) The development, distribution and analysis of a questionnaire to survey Western Australian Local Government members.

The intention of the survey was to identify the members' speed management and enforcement activities past, present and future, and to canvass their opinions and attitudes on issues raised in the project brief developed by WALGA.

- C) Liaise with key State government stakeholders involved in the State's speed management and enforcement process and the collection and sharing of speed data to document the State's speed management and enforcement process (including legislation and regulation).

Project staff liaised with agencies such as Western Australia Police, Main Roads Western Australia, and the Western Australian Office of Road Safety to document their respective management roles and current co-operative arrangements with Western Australian Local Government in regards to speed enforcement and broader management issues.

3. Summary of the *Phase One* Research Findings

3.1 International Review of the Role of Local Government in Speed Enforcement Management

The most relevant information on the formal contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management was found for Germany and the United Kingdom and to a much lesser extent in the USA. No evidence could be found in any other jurisdiction of the formalised contribution of Local Government to the enforcement of speeding or any other on-road traffic behaviour. Notwithstanding this finding, one short term collaborative program involving Local Government and police to reduce speeding was noted in New South Wales.

Germany

Legislative provisions give Local Governments in Germany authority, independent of the police, to undertake mobile camera enforcement of speeding on local area roads only. All camera operations ranging from the administration and the deployment of cameras to the issue of infringements and collection of fine revenue are the responsibility of the respective Local Government. State police are responsible for enforcement on State roads such as highways and may also undertake enforcement on local area roads (seemingly without due consultation with and consideration for the enforcement programs of the Local Government). The Local Government speed enforcement programs are expected to be 'self funding', in that the State does not contribute to the financial management of the program, nor does the State receive revenue from the Local Government program. Unfortunately no information could be found to determine how widespread the program is. Further to this, there is no available evidence to determine the road safety benefit of the contribution of German Local Government to speed enforcement. The German system represents the most extreme example of the contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management given the independence and autonomy afforded to Local Government under this model. The devolvement of the responsibility of the enforcement of speeding to Local Government in Western Australia, even on a shared basis, would require a considerable shift in the socioculture surrounding speed enforcement and the nature and responsibilities of Local Government, not to mention the legislative and financial restructures required to support such a change. That said, there are provisions in the Road Traffic Act 1974 (WA), the Road Traffic Code 2000 (WA) and the Police Act 1892 (WA) that would permit the 'outsourcing' of enforcement activities to Local Government.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

United Kingdom

In the UK, partnerships of police, local authorities and the court system conduct what is known as the 'safety camera' program. This is primarily a system of over 5,000 (as at 2007) fixed 'black spot' speed (and red light) cameras, though mobile cameras and point to point cameras are gradually being introduced. The program is administered by the UK Department of Transport and was initially financed on a 'cost recovery' basis, meaning that local partnerships were permitted to recoup the funds required to administer the program with all other monies returned government revenue. Recent changes to the Road Safety Act (2006) meant that surplus revenue from the safety camera program could also be used by public authorities and to provide for Road Safety Grants to local authorities to assist in the cost of promoting road safety in local areas. The most up to date information on the road safety partnership program however, is that funding to local councils is being substantially reduced by the UK government, which will inevitably force many councils to end or scale back their camera programs (Express.com.uk; July 2010). A number of reviews have been conducted of the safety benefit of the program with all demonstrating a reduction in both vehicle speeds and casualties around the camera sites. The cost-benefit ratio in the third year of the program was estimated to be around 4:1. Overall, the UK program is an innovative approach to sharing the responsibility and costs for area wide camera based enforcement of speed (and red-light running). The value of this program to the current WALGA project is its focus on establishing partnerships between police and government authorities at a local level and a proven model of cost-recovery to fund a high level of enforcement activity with demonstrated road safety benefits.

USA

In the USA traffic enforcement is undertaken at the State, County and municipal City level. The USA has an extensive speed camera program across 56 jurisdictions and an even larger red light camera program. How and where both programs operate (e.g., type and location of road, time of day, length of time) and who runs the programs depends on the legislation that has been passed at the State, County or local municipal level. Some evidence was found to indicate that the red light camera programs of some municipalities are administered by non-police personnel, while other City councils use sworn police personnel, particularly in the case of speed camera programs, to administer the programs and to undertake enforcement. Whilst municipalities in the USA appear to be most unlike those in Australia in regards to administrative and legal responsibilities and financing, the model of automated enforcement

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

in the US does offer insight into how enforcement programs can be devolved to local council authorities who hold full financial control and administrative independence. The adoption of such a model would present the same challenges and require similar changes as those described above for the adoption of the German Local Government enforcement model.

New South Wales

There are instances in Australia of Local Government *partnering* with local police in the collection and use of speed data for strategic and targeted enforcement by police, coupled with an educational initiative conducted by the Local Government. In New South Wales, the Roads and Traffic Authority's Local Government Road Safety Program exemplifies how Local Government can be encouraged to work co-operatively with police to reduce speeding and associated crashes. The Lower Hunter Speed Project is testament to this process (Port Stephens Council, nd). Under the program councils in the Lower Hunter region monitored the speeds of vehicles on a selected number of roads and provided this information to police to conduct targeted enforcement. For the 2005-2006 program, an additional 31 hours of police enforcement (resulting in the issue of 56 infringement notices for speeding and nine charges) and 680 hours of courtesy speed checks was undertaken across the Lower Hunter region. The best results were said to be found for the Local Government area of Port Stephens, where reductions in mean 85th percentile speeds ranged between two and four points across the area's three sites over the period August 2005 to June 2006 (Port Stephens Council, nd). In contrast to the models of Local Government involvement noted for Germany, UK and the USA, the data sharing and targeted enforcement model of the Lower Hunter Speed Project represents a simpler, easier and relatively cheap alternative for Local Government to contribute to speed enforcement. However, it relies heavily on the willingness and availability of Local Government to undertake a program of vehicle speed monitoring and local police personnel to undertake the enforcement that is required. Both requirements may or may not incur additional costs above levels of monitoring and enforcement that may already be in operation. Most importantly, the model is akin to the informal arrangements occurring between some local police and councils reported in the survey of Western Australian Local Government (see details below).

3.2 Findings from the Survey of Western Australian Local Government

An 'on-line' questionnaire was developed to survey Western Australian Local Government members on issues pertaining to speed monitoring, speed management (including

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

enforcement and speed zoning), and road safety administration. With the exception of the Shires of Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands, n=139 Western Australian Local Governments were invited to participate in the survey. The survey remained open for approximately four weeks, after which time 33 councils (12 metropolitan; 21 non-metropolitan) had completed and submitted the survey. This represents around 23.7% of eligible Western Australian councils. Findings from the survey relevant to the workshop activities of *Phase Two* of the project are summarised below. These relate to the issues of Vehicle Travel Speed Monitoring; Local Government involvement in speed enforcement and associated attitudes, and Local Government capacity for and attitudes to road safety management

Vehicle Travel Speed Monitoring

With the exception of four *Non-Urban* councils, all respondent councils reported the monitoring of vehicle travel speeds using MetroCount equipment. Though one-third of monitoring councils claimed to use a list of designated sites for monitoring, the most commonly mentioned criterion for monitoring vehicle speeds across *Urban* (86%) and *Non-Urban* (80%) councils was the receipt of ‘*Complaints from residents, businesses, and school contacts*’. Other responses from councils indicated that the most common uses for speed monitoring data were for the general recording and archiving of travel speeds on Local Government roads; the development of traffic calming initiatives, and to support Black Spot Treatment applications and submissions for changes in posted speed limits. Compared with *Non-urban* councils *Urban* councils were more extensive in their uses of collected speed data. Overall, the amount of monitoring undertaken did not appear to be substantial with less than half of respondent councils monitoring 11 or more sites in each of the last two financial years.

The greater administrative support within *Urban* councils for dealing with speed monitoring was also evident by the greater proportion that routinely reviewed speed data: 86% *versus* 29% of *Non-Urban* councils. This finding, in conjunction with others suggests that *Non-Urban* councils are not utilising their speed data productively, most likely because, comparatively, they do not have the necessary administrative resources and expertise to do so.

While councils do share speed data with Main Roads WA and WA Police, the sharing is not routinely undertaken but is limited to specific circumstances. Councils share data with Main Roads WA via applications for Black Spot Treatment funding and a change in posted speed

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

limit and at other times if specifically requested. For WA Police, the main reason councils share speed data is when speeding in excess of the 85th percentile is identified and police enforcement is requested. Overall, *Urban* councils were more likely than *Non-Urban* councils to share speed data with both Main Roads WA and WA Police. Councils unfortunately provided little information on the mechanism for sharing data (other than to report figures in written submission or letters), nor were substantial problems with sharing identified. What is evident is the *absence of an on-going formal or routine arrangement for the sharing of speed data between councils and Main Roads WA and WA Police*. This is just one of the areas where councils and Main Roads WA and WA Police could develop and implement a standardised data sharing arrangement with defined objectives and outcomes. However, councils did not uniformly agree on a standard protocol for monitoring or reporting speed data and for sharing data with WA Police.

Attitudes toward a number speed monitoring issues also showed that councils were not a homogenous group. Councils did not uniformly agree on issues such as:

- the need for mandatory annual monitoring of vehicle travel speeds;
- the establishment of abiding guidelines for the analysis and reporting of the data;
- how to efficiently use of speed data;
- the efficiency of the processes for sharing data with WA Police and Main Roads WA; and
- the requirement to provide police with a monthly listing of roads for priority speed enforcement.

Overall there was some evidence to suggest that *Urban* councils are more positive and supportive than *Non-Urban* councils on most of the above issues. This is possibly due to the greater capacity of *Urban* councils to support speed monitoring related initiatives and their greater focus on and concern for speeding on their local roads. *These findings suggest that Non-Urban councils in particular require additional support to undertake a more committed and effective speed monitoring program that would further support future speed management initiatives with Main Roads WA and WA Police.*

Speed Enforcement

Councils reported a reasonable level of co-operation with WA Police in regard to determining both the *location* and *frequency* of local area speed enforcement, with a greater level of co-operation with police reported by *Non-Urban* councils compared with *Urban* councils.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Most councils claimed to be *satisfied* with the current level of enforcement on their local roads and rated the enforcement as *effective*. These ratings were however, found to vary by location of council with a greater proportion of *Non-Urban* councils expressing satisfaction with the level of enforcement and rating the enforcement as effective. The reasons cited across all councils for being satisfied with the level of enforcement included the positive and appropriate response of police; their general visibility on local roads, and willingness to liaise to discuss local area speed enforcement. On the other hand, dissatisfied councils made mention of the lack of enforcement on local roads compared with major roads and poor feedback from police on enforcement activities within their Local Government area.

In general, councils considered that both the frequency and effectiveness of speed enforcement could be improved by increasing police presence on the road; by undertaking targeted strategic enforcement, which included making greater use of local speed data, and even allowing Local Government to undertake enforcement activities. With respect to this last suggestion, *nearly half of the respondent councils did not support the enforcement of speeding by Local Government, with only a third indicating some level of support for the option*. Once again *Urban* and *Non-Urban* councils differed with the latter being more supportive of the option. Councils who opposed this option cited resourcing, skill and legislative issues as substantial barriers, while councils who supported the option cited a greater capacity to conduct a more strategic level of enforcement based on local knowledge as a key issue (though staff would still need to be appropriately trained and skilled).

The above findings suggest there is considerable scope for improving the co-operation between many councils and police for local area speed enforcement, and perhaps more so for *Urban* than *Non-Urban* councils. It appears that the absence of a formalised arrangement between councils and police for the planning and implementation of strategic enforcement is at the heart of the disquiet expressed by councils. Such an arrangement would hopefully lead to a greater level of communication (including speed data sharing) between police and council and increase the strategic value of enforcement.

Councils commented that *efforts to increase both the level and effectiveness of local area enforcement would require additional resources (financial and physical) which should be provided by the State (which includes WA Police)*. Councils' concern over the level of financial and physical resources required to bolster local area speed enforcement also applied to enforcement that might be undertaken by councils themselves. This concern was one of a

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

number that contributed to nearly half of the respondent councils not supporting Local Government enforcement of speeding. Thus, *workable models of Local Government enforcement of speeding would in the first instance need to be financially viable or at the very least 'cost neutral' to gain additional support from councils.* This is an important point for discussion in the Phase Two workshop.

Road Safety Management

The road safety management capacity and capabilities of Local Government are an important consideration in the development of prospective speed enforcement management models. The survey findings showed that councils varied considerably in regard to the level of available finances, staffing, administrative structures, knowledge, leadership, and community support required to develop and manage road safety related activities. *Only a quarter of respondent councils considered they were sufficiently financial to undertake the road safety related activities it would currently like to.* Perhaps because of this, *respondent councils as group employed relatively few dedicated road safety personnel (i.e. Road Safety or Travel Smart officers) though many more councils did report the co-ordination of a RoadWise or similar road safety committee.* Consistent with this, *around half of the respondent councils agreed there was a lack of appropriate staff within their council to undertake road safety related activities.* Knowledge of the State's road safety strategy, Toward Zero, was also noted to be limited among council staff and elected councillors. Correspondingly, *only a third of respondent councils claimed their road safety strategies, plan or policies included safe system principles which underlie the Toward Zero strategy.* On a positive note, the majority of respondent councils considered there to be strong leadership among council officers and elected councillors, and reasonably good support within the ratepayer community, to undertake road safety related activities. In addition, the majority of councils did not consider they had difficulty engaging or involving other required road safety agencies (e.g., Main Roads WA, Office of Road Safety; WALGA) in their local road safety initiatives. The majority of councils similarly believed that working in collaboration with other Local Governments in their area would increase the efficiency of their road safety related activities. This is a particularly encouraging finding given as Western Australian Local Government works toward a more sustainable and cost-efficient model of management.

Councils were however, *reasonably divided on the benefit of their involvement in enforcing road traffic laws more generally.* Like many councils who did not support Local Government

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

enforcement of speeding, *close to half of the respondent councils, and particularly Non-Urban councils, disagreed that road safety would be substantially improved if Local Government were given shared responsibility for the enforcement of traffic laws.* Some opposing councils maintained the line that *enforcement should not be a Local Government responsibility and that Local Government could not reasonably resource the requirement.* Again, these are important issues to develop in the Phase Two workshop. On the other hand, supporting councils again cited the benefit of local knowledge leading to strategic and more effective enforcement.

While it is encouraging to note the level of leadership within council and support within the community and road safety-Local Government network, *the acknowledged limited resources for road safety related activities and limited knowledge of Toward Zero poses some cause for concern.* The strategy has identified Local Government as a significant contributor to the development and implementation of safe system initiatives to reduce road trauma. Clearly this sector needs to be well-resourced, skilled and knowledgeable to make the effective contribution that is required. This is particularly so for the *Non-Urban* council sector which evidenced fewer resources, knowledge and support.

An appropriate level of financial and physical resourcing for councils is nevertheless required to support the significant road safety contribution expected of Local Government, irrespective of their contribution to speed enforcement management. Without *an increase in resources Western Australian councils cannot be expected to undertake anything more than a minor supporting role in speed enforcement or traffic law enforcement more generally.* As previously stated, any model to enable the enforcement of traffic laws by Local Government must be financially viable or at the very least 'cost neutral' to gain additional support from councils.

3.3 Legislative and Administrative Issues Associated with Speed Enforcement by Local Government

Understanding the legislative and administrative issues associated with speed enforcement is central to consideration of some of the possible models of Local Government contribution to speed enforcement management.

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Wardens and Special Constables

Though police have sole responsibility for the enforcement of the State's regulations for speeding on gazetted public roads, the Commissioner of Police also has authority to deputise persons with powers to enforce road traffic laws. The Road Traffic Act 1974 (WA), the Road Traffic Code 2000 (WA), The Road Traffic (Administration) Act 2008 (see *Part 2-Administration-General Matters Sections 23 and 24*) and The Police Act 1892 (WA) are relevant to these activities. These provisions *could* allow Local Government officers to be appointed as Wardens or Special Constables, either of which would permit them to enforce the Road Traffic Act and Road Traffic Code or designated sections thereof.

Authorisation to Use Measuring Equipment

The Road Traffic Act 1974 also contains provisions that *could* authorise the use of speed measuring equipment by Local Government officers.

The Distribution and Use of Monetary Penalties for Speeding

Monies from speed offences generated by the State's camera programs (speed and red-light) are in part credited to the Road Trauma Trust Account. The Road Safety Council Act 2002 *Section 12 (1) Road Trauma Trust Account* notes that *one-third of each prescribed penalty paid pursuant to a photograph-based vehicle infringement notice must be credited to the Road Trauma Trust Fund*. The remaining two-thirds of camera generated offence monies are directed to consolidated revenue, along with all other traffic offence monies. Under these arrangements Local Government could not retain the funds generated from their camera based enforcement of speeding, nor can Road Trauma Trust funds be used to purchase or support infrastructure or equipment required for speed enforcement. Consequently, if Local Government wished to conduct camera based enforcement a new mechanism for funding the activity would need to be established, particularly since Local Government appears unable to finance enforcement as part of their ever increasing range of responsibilities.

4. Preliminary Models of Local Government Speed Enforcement Management and Workshop Activity Guidelines

The review of the published and unpublished literature and other information has identified three possible broad models for the formalised contribution of Local Government to speed enforcement management. These models are the focus of discussion at the Phase Two

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

workshop on August 4th. Working titles for the model and some broad details of the model are presented below.

At the workshop you will be allocated to a group of around 10 local government officers and Councillors. Your group will be led by a member of the project research team whose task will be to facilitate a discussion of both the *general nature of the model* and the *relevance and merits of the model* for your council. Groups may choose to dismiss certain models outright as ‘unworkable or without merit’ or they may choose to ‘change or tweak’ elements to make them more workable.

In your consideration of the models we would ask you to bear in mind the following issues as they apply to your council:

- the physical, administrative and financial resourcing required for their implementation; what barriers do you see to adopting one or more of the models and what factors or structures currently exist to facilitate the adoption of one or more of the models;
- the acceptance and ‘fit’ of the models within your council’s objectives and strategic direction for road safety and broader community agenda;
- the perceived value of the models to generate additional speed enforcement and to improve road safety in your local area, and,
- the likely acceptance or otherwise of the various models by your local community and relevant local road safety stakeholders

Throughout the discussion you should also consider:

- how existing funding arrangements and/or the development of new funding arrangements could be used to support the models in question;
- other legislation that may need to be changed or developed to support the adoption of the models in question;
- what training of Local Government personnel is required and how this can be obtained/provided, and
- what additional data or information would need to be considered before deciding whether a council should adopt any given model, for example, what is the likely number of offences to be detected and how financially viable any given model may be given projections of reduced speeding behaviour as a result of improved enforcement on local area roads; what is the likely cost-benefit ratio of any given model.

Models

1. Autonomous and independent enforcement by Local Government on local area roads

- Local Government staff to use hand held digital camera under legislation providing for Wardens or Special Constables
- Consideration could be given to combined speed and red light (intersection) camera operations
- Consideration could also be given to ‘fixed’ black spot speed camera operation
- Consideration could also be given to ‘point to point’ speed camera operations in regional areas of WA
- Local Government would not be permitted to stop motorists to issue infringements
- Local Government would be free to determine the location and frequency of their enforcement activities independent of police
- Local Government would seek to either retain either whole or part of the funds generated by their camera program or establish some other cost-recovery (+ ?) measure
- Funds would need to be sourced to cover the initial purchase of hand held digital cameras and others
- Processing of digital images would be done by Local Government (least preferred) or alternatively upload to police administrative systems for processing (most preferred)

2. The establishment of local area partnerships between Local Government and police

- Local Government would establish formal partnerships with local area police to jointly manage speed camera (fixed) infrastructure and work in partnership with police to undertake roadside mobile speed enforcement (officers and police working as a cohesive local area ‘road traffic’ unit)
- Local Government would maintain a program of vehicle speed monitoring for use in the establishment of jointly determined targeted enforcement programs
- Funding of the program (infrastructure and personnel) would be on a cost-recovery basis, though start-up funds may be required or underwritten
- Partnership would use existing police administrative systems to process infringements

3. Formalised data monitoring and sharing to enable targeted enforcement by police *only*

- Under this model Local Government would establish a formal and targeted program of on-going vehicle speed monitoring
- Formal agreements would be established with local area police to provide them with up to date vehicle speed data

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

- No enforcement to be undertaken by Local Government; their role is to provide data and administrative support to police
- Funds to support Local Government vehicle speed monitoring to be provided by police (?) or sourced from elsewhere

APPENDIX C

Email invitation to WA Police, Local Government and other road safety stakeholders to participate in the Phase 3 on-line survey

Local Government Enhanced Speed Enforcement Management Project

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to invite your [Local Government/Agency] to participate in an **on-line** survey of speed enforcement management that is being sponsored by the Road Safety Council of Western Australia via the Road Trauma Trust Fund.

We are a team of researchers from the *Monash University Accident Research Centre*, Melbourne, and the *Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre*, Curtin University. We have been contracted by the *Western Australian Local Government Association* to review the role of Local Government in the management and potential legal enforcement of vehicle travel speeds.

The on-line survey we are asking you to complete will provide you with an opportunity to review and provide feedback on two models for the potential involvement on Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

The attached briefing document outlines the project activities undertaken to date and details the models we are asking you to review. Please familiarise yourself with this document before accessing the on-line survey.

We have also attached a 'hard copy' of the survey for you to review prior to logging on to the survey website (see the link below) to assist your preparation of a response. Please note that all submissions must be made via the survey website; do not complete the hard copy.

Though WALGA has identified you as the most appropriate person in your Local Government for completion of the survey, we are happy for you to consult with your colleagues (by sharing the attached documents with them) on the most appropriate response for your Local Government. However, we ask that you make the final submission. Please do not forward the link to the survey website on to others for access. Only one submission is required.

You will be able to enter and exit the survey site and return as many times as it takes to complete the survey.

The survey for Local Government respondents can be accessed by clicking the following hyperlink:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/YMH9B9R>

At the site you will find further details about the project, who to contact if you have any questions, and information on your responsibilities and rights if you wish to participate in the survey.

We encourage you to **complete and submit the survey by Friday 15th April 2011**.

If you have trouble accessing the survey page or have any questions about the survey, including the intended use of the survey responses, please contact me either by email or telephone (details below).

Thank you in anticipation of your interest and time.

Best wishes

Peter Palamara
Research Fellow | Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre | School of Public Health
Curtin University of Technology | GPO Box U1987 | Perth | Western Australia 6845
Telephone +61 8 9266 2304 | Facsimile +61 8 9266 2958 | Mobile 041 222 8510
Email p.palamara@curtin.edu.au

APPENDIX D

**Local Government , WA Police and other road safety stakeholder versions of the Phase
Three on-line survey**

1. Introduction for Local Government respondents

Introduction:

Thank you for your participation in this next activity of the Western Australian Local Government Speed Enforcement Project.

State and Local Government and non-government agencies that have a role or interest in the management of speeding in Western Australia are invited to complete the survey to share their views on two models for the participation of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

You will be asked to respond to statements and questions about each of the models. Some of the statements relate to general issues while others relate to more specific implementation issues for each model.

Before proceeding, please ensure that you have familiarised yourself with the background briefing document for the project that was emailed to you with the link to this survey. This document describes the two models you are being asked to review and answer questions about.

Background to the current survey:

The models of speed enforcement management presented here have been developed from earlier project activities including an on-line survey and workshop for Local Government personnel. The feedback you provide will be used to refine the models for distribution to and further comment by Local Government.

Management of the project:

This project is being conducted by the Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC) in collaboration with the Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (C-MARC) on behalf of the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA). Sponsorship for the project has been provided by the Road Trauma Trust Fund of Western Australia. If you have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in the survey please contact the following persons:

Peter Palamara
Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre
p.palamara@curtin.edu.au
(08) 9266-2304

Mal Shervill
Western Australian Local Government Association
mshervill@walga.asn.au
(08) 9213-2068

Informed consent:

This survey has been approved for distribution by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, Curtin University of Technology. If you wish to speak with someone about the ethics of your participation in this project you may contact Linda Teasdale, Ethics Officer, Curtin University of Technology, (08) 9266-2784.

If you consent to participate in the survey you will be acknowledging that:

1. Information you provide will be used for the purpose of developing local government initiatives to manage the enforcement of vehicle travel speeds.
2. Your participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw your consent at any time without prejudice.
3. Your participation does not imply your consent to participate in future activities for the WALGA Speed Enforcement Project, though you may be invited to do so in the future.
4. You have the right to keep your responses anonymous to the project sponsor, which means that we will not share your information with WALGA in a way that would identify you or your place of work.
5. You are required to keep the survey material 'confidential'. The survey should not be shared or passed on to others to complete. However, the content may be discussed with others for the purpose of formulating a response to the questions asked of you.

When you are ready to commence the survey please tick the consent box below and indicate whether you wish your responses to remain anonymous to WALGA. Then click the 'Next' button. You may save your responses and exit the survey to return later on.

We would appreciate your completion and submission of the survey by April 15th 2011.

*** 1. I hereby consent to participate in the Western Australian Local Government Association Speed Enforcement Management survey**

please tick to indicate your consent

*** 2. Do you wish your name and place of employment to remain anonymous to WALGA?**

Yes

No

2. Background Information

Please provide the following information.

* 3. Please provide the following details about yourself

Name:

Place of employment

Email Address:

Phone Number:

4. Please state your employment position or title

5. Which of the previous WALGA Speed Enforcement Management project activities have you participated in to date?

Select all that apply, otherwise leave blank.

- Completion of the first on-line survey
- Participation in the first workshop to review an earlier version of the Models

3. Model 3: General issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

6. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements for Model 3.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve police's understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police enforcement of vehicle speeds on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

7. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

5

6

4. Model 3: Local Government issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

8. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements for Model 3

	Strong Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
Subject to appropriate financing arrangements, my Local Government would be willing to participate in the proposed model to supply local area vehicle traffic speed data to WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Under the proposed model, my Local Government would need to increase the number of vehicle traffic counts it presently conducts each year	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government has sufficient personnel to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government does not have the financial resources required to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government would prefer to enter the proposed partnership with WA Police as part of a regional grouping of councils	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government would look to employ a subcontractor to undertake the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government believes the local residents would not approve of the council providing police with information about speeding to assist local area enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government already supplies WA Police with enough information about speeding on local area roads to assist with	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

their enforcement activities

My Local Government supports the idea of creating a database for the upload of vehicle traffic speed data for access by WA Police

ja

ja

ja

ja

ja

9. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements

	5
	6

5. Model 3: Local Government issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

10. Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed number of annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?

(see Table 2.2 in the briefing document for the proposed number of counts per Local Government by size)

My Local Government thinks the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'about right'

My Local Government thinks the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'excessive'

My Local Government thinks the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'too low'

My Local Government is 'undecided' about the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts

11. Please provide comments to explain your response to the proposed annual number of vehicle traffic counts.

If you think the requirement is too low or excessive, please indicate what you think is a more appropriate number of counts per annum for your Local Government.

12. Which one of the following statements best reflects your assessment of the proposed costs of the annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government?

(see Table 2.3 in the briefing document for the proposed cost of the number of counts per Local Government by size)

My Local Government thinks the proposed costs for the annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'about right'

My Local Government thinks the proposed costs for the annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'excessive'

My Local Government thinks the proposed costs for the annual number of vehicle traffic counts is 'too low'

My Local Government is 'undecided' about the proposed costs for annual number of vehicle traffic counts

13. Please provide comments to explain your response to the proposed costs of the annual number of vehicle traffic counts.

If you think the proposed costs are too low or excessive, please indicate what you think is a more appropriate estimate of the cost of conducting the annual vehicle traffic counts for your Local Government.

14. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- Main Roads Western Australia
- WA Treasury via a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other (please indicate in box below)

15. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program

6. Model 3: General comments

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

16. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 3, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

	5
	6

7. Model 2: General issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

17. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements about Model 2

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is not a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding only on the local area roads it is directly responsible for	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under any circumstance	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and the issue of infringement notices	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
If Local Government undertakes camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI Trucam in 'automatic' mode and not	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

stop motorists to issue an
infringement notice

18. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

	5
	6

8. Model 2: Local Government issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

19. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements for Model 2

	Strong Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
My Local Government is opposed to undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government does not currently have sufficient employees to work as camera operators to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government has sufficient administrative capacity to support the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government does not support the use of Rangers to conduct the proposed camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government would need to receive financial compensation to undertake the proposed camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government would prefer to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police as part of a regional grouping of Local Governments	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government believes that local residents would not approve of us undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government believes that no additional enforcement of speeding is required on its local area roads	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
My Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

supports the idea of creating an Internet based system for the upload of digital camera images it collects for processing by WA Police

My Local Government believes that it should work with WA Police to jointly determine the weekly schedule of camera enforcement to be conducted by Local Government

jn

jn

jn

jn

jn

20. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements

	5
	6

9. Model 2: Local Government issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

21. If your Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police, how many hours per day of roadside enforcement would you be prepared to undertake?

22. If your Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera for use?

Loan one from WA Police at no cost

Purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer for exclusive use and recoup the costs as required

Purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer as part of a regional grouping of Local Government and share the use and recoup the costs as required

Other (please specify below)

23. Please indicate other possible means for the supply of a camera for undertaking speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

24. Table 2.5 provides a number of assumptions used to estimate the costs of outsourcing camera based speed enforcement to Local Government.

Please comment on the accuracy or otherwise of the cost components that are relevant to your Local Government (e.g., support vehicle, camera operator) if it were to undertake camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police.

Feel free to provide 'corrected' costings if appropriate and to indicate what other costs should be considered.

25. If your Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what is your preference for remuneration for your service?

- Recovery of all costs for hours of camera operation and administration
- Receive an agreed percentage of the monetary fine for each detected offence
- Receive an annual grant to finance a specified number of hours of camera operation and administration
- Other (please specify below)

26. Please indicate other possible modes of remuneration for undertaking camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

27. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program component)?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- WA Treasury under a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other (please indicate in box below)

28. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the vehicle traffic count program component)

10. Model 2: General comments

Model 2:

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

29. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 2, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

30. Would your Local Government be prepared to participate in a future workshop on the proposed models of speed enforcement management? If so, please indicate your preferred location, otherwise leave blank

- Bunbury
- Geraldton
- Perth

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you have any questions about the survey or your participation, please contact Peter Palamara, C-MARC, on 9266-2304 or email p.palamara@curtin.edu.au

1. Introduction for WA Police respondents

Introduction:

Thank you for your participation in this next activity of the Western Australian Local Government Speed Enforcement Project.

State and Local Government and non-government agencies that have an interest or role in the management of speeding in Western Australia are invited to complete the survey to share their views on two models for the participation of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

You will be asked to respond to statements and questions about each of the models. Some of the statements relate to general principles while others relate to more specific implementation issues for each model.

Before proceeding, please ensure that you have familiarised yourself with the background briefing document for the project that was emailed to you with the link to this survey. This document describes the two models you are being asked to review and answer questions about.

Background to the current survey:

The models of speed enforcement management presented here have been developed from earlier project activities including an on-line survey and workshop for Local Government personnel. The feedback you provide will be used to refine the models for distribution to and further comment by Local Government.

Management of the project:

This project is being conducted by the Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC) in collaboration with the Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (C-MARC) on behalf of the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA). Sponsorship for the project has been provided by the Road Trauma Trust Fund of Western Australia. If you have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in the survey please contact the following persons:

Peter Palamara
Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre
p.palamara@curtin.edu.au
(08) 9266-2304

Mal Shervill
Western Australian Local Government Association
mshervill@walga.asn.au
(08) 9213-2068

Informed consent:

This survey has been approved for distribution by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, Curtin University of Technology. If you wish to speak with someone about the ethics of your participation in this project you may contact Linda Teasdale, Ethics Officer, Curtin University of Technology, (08) 9266-2784.

If you consent to participate in the survey you will be acknowledging that:

1. Information you provide will be used for the purpose of developing local government initiatives to manage the enforcement of vehicle travel speeds.
2. Your participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw your consent at any time without prejudice.
3. Your participation does not imply your consent to participate in future activities for the WALGA Speed Enforcement Project, though you may be invited to do so in the future.
4. You have the right to keep your responses anonymous to the project sponsor, which means that we will not share your information with WALGA in a way that would identify you or your place of work.
5. You are required to keep the survey material 'confidential'. The survey should not be shared or passed on to others to complete. However, the content may be discussed with others for the purpose of formulating a response to the questions asked of you.

When you are ready to commence the survey please tick the consent box below and indicate whether you wish your responses to remain anonymous to WALGA. Then click the 'Next' button. You may save your responses and exit the survey to return later on.

We would appreciate your completion and submission of the survey by April 15th 2011.

*** 1. I hereby consent to participate in the Western Australian Local Government Association Speed Enforcement Management survey**

please tick to indicate your consent

*** 2. Do you wish your name and place of employment to remain anonymous to WALGA?**

Yes

No

2. Background Information

Please provide the following information.

* 3. Please provide the following details about yourself

Name:

Place of employment

Email Address:

Phone Number:

4. Please state your employment position or title

5. Which of the previous WALGA Speed Enforcement Management project activities have you participated in to date?

Select all that apply, otherwise leave blank.

- Completion of the first on-line survey
- Participation in the first workshop to review an earlier version of the Models

3. Model 3: General issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

6. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements for Model 3.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve police's understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police enforcement of vehicle speeds on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

7. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

5

6

4. Model 3: WA Police issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

8. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements for Model 3

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
WA Police does not support the proposed partnership with Local Government for the supply and use of local area vehicle speed data for enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed model will lead to a substantial increase in the overall number of hours of enforcement to be delivered by WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police has the administrative capacity required to process the information supplied by Local Government on local area roads that require speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police already has enough information on which local area roads require speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police supports the idea of creating a database for the upload of vehicle traffic speed data by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police supports the development of a protocol to ensure that identified problem local area roads receive sufficient speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police does not have the financial resources required to deliver the enforcement of local area roads required under this model	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Any additional enforcement required under this model could be provided under the proposed 'Best Practice' strategy of speed enforcement that is being implemented	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

9. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements

	5
	6

10. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- Main Roads Western Australia
- WA Treasury via a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other (please indicate in box below)

11. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program

	5
	6

5. Model 3: General comments

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

12. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 3, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

	5
	6

6. Model 2: General issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

13. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements about Model 2

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is not a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding only on the local area roads it is directly responsible for	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under any circumstance	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and the issue of infringement notices	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
If Local Government undertakes camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI Trucam in 'automatic' mode and not	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

stop motorists to issue an
infringement notice

14. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

	5
	6

7. Model 2: WA Police issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

15. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements for Model 2

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
WA Police supports the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government will reduce the number of hours of enforcement WA Police will need to provide on some local area roads	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police do not consider there is a need for additional speed enforcement on lower speed, lower volume local area roads	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police has the administrative resources required to support the outsourcing of a camera based speed enforcement to Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police supports the need to develop an Internet based system for the upload of digital camera images captured by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police does not have the financial resources required to process the digital images and issue the infringements that would be generated by a Local Government camera based speed enforcement program	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police would be prepared to administer the Internet based system to be used for the upload of digital camera images captured by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police believe the LTI Trucam is the most appropriate mobile digital speed camera for use by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

WA Police believe they should independently determine the weekly schedule of camera enforcement to be undertaken by Local Government

jñ

jñ

jñ

jñ

jñ

WA Police do not support the use of Local Government Rangers to conduct the proposed camera based enforcement

jñ

jñ

jñ

jñ

jñ

16. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements

	5
	6

8. Model 2: WA Police issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

17. If camera based enforcement was outsourced to Local Government what would WA Police's preference be for the supply of a camera to Local Government for use?

For WA Police to purchase the required cameras and to loan them to Local Government at no cost

For Local Government to purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer for their exclusive use and recoup the costs as required

For regional groupings of Local Government to purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer and share the use and recoup the costs as required

Other (please specify below)

18. Please indicate other possible means for the supply of a camera to Local Government for use

19. Table 2.5 provides a number of assumptions used to estimate the costs of outsourcing camera based speed enforcement to Local Government.

Please comment on the accuracy or otherwise of the cost components that are relevant to WA Police (e.g., image processing and follow up; cost of training operators) if it were to outsource camera based speed enforcement to Local Government.

Feel free to provide 'corrected' costings if appropriate and to indicate what other costs should be considered.

20. Table 2.7 provides a number of assumptions used to estimate the revenue raised through outsourcing camera based speed enforcement to Local Government.

Please comment on the accuracy or otherwise of these estimates (e.g., mean value of fine; fine payment rate).

Feel free to provide 'corrected' estimates if appropriate and to indicate what other revenue components should be considered.

21. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program component)?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- WA Treasury under a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other (please indicate in box below)

22. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the vehicle traffic count program component)

	5
	6

23. If camera based enforcement was outsourced to Local Government, please indicate WA Police's preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service?

- That Local Government should recover all costs for the hours of camera operation and administration
- That Local Government should receive an agreed percentage of the monetary fine for each detected offence
- That Local Government receive an annual grant to finance a specified number of hours of camera operation and administration
- Other (please specify below)

24. Please indicate other possible modes of remuneration for Local Government

	5
	6

9. Model 2: General comments

Model 2:

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

25. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 2, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you have any questions about the survey or your participation, please contact Peter Palamara, C-MARC, on 9266-2304 or email p.palamara@curtin.edu.au

1. Introduction

Introduction:

Thank you for your participation in this next activity of the Western Australian Local Government Speed Enforcement Project.

State and Local Government and non-government agencies that have an interest or role in the management of speeding in Western Australia are invited to complete the survey to share their views on two models for the participation of Local Government in the management of speed enforcement.

You will be asked to respond to statements and questions about each of the models. Some of the statements relate to general principles while others relate to more specific implementation issues for each model.

Before proceeding, please ensure that you have familiarised yourself with the background briefing document for the project that was emailed to you with the link to this survey. This document describes the two models you are being asked to review and answer questions about.

Background to the current survey:

The models of speed enforcement management presented here have been developed from earlier project activities including an on-line survey and workshop for Local Government personnel. The feedback you provide will be used to refine the models for distribution to and further comment by Local Government.

Management of the project:

This project is being conducted by the Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC) in collaboration with the Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre (C-MARC) on behalf of the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA). Sponsorship for the project has been provided by the Road Trauma Trust Fund of Western Australia. If you have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in the survey please contact the following persons:

Peter Palamara
Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre
p.palamara@curtin.edu.au
(08) 9266-2304

Mal Shervill
Western Australian Local Government Association
mshervill@walga.asn.au
(08) 9213-2068

Informed consent:

This survey has been approved for distribution by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, Curtin University of Technology. If you wish to speak with someone about the ethics of your participation in this project you may contact Linda Teasdale, Ethics Officer, Curtin University of Technology, (08) 9266-2784.

If you consent to participate in the survey you will be acknowledging that:

1. Information you provide will be used for the purpose of developing local government initiatives to manage the enforcement of vehicle travel speeds.
2. Your participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw your consent at any time without prejudice.
3. Your participation does not imply your consent to participate in future activities for the WALGA Speed Enforcement Project, though you may be invited to do so in the future.
4. You have the right to keep your responses anonymous to the project sponsor, which means that we will not share your information with WALGA in a way that would identify you or your place of work.
5. You are required to keep the survey material 'confidential'. The survey should not be shared or passed on to others to complete. However, the content may be discussed with others for the purpose of formulating a response to the questions asked of you.

When you are ready to commence the survey please tick the consent box below and indicate whether you wish your responses to remain anonymous to WALGA. Then click the 'Next' button. You may save your responses and exit the survey to return later on.

We would appreciate your completion and submission of the survey by April 15th 2011.

*** 1. I hereby consent to participate in the Western Australian Local Government Association Speed Enforcement Management survey**

please tick to indicate your consent

*** 2. Do you wish your name and place of employment to remain anonymous to WALGA?**

Yes

No

2. Background Information

Please provide the following information.

* 3. Please provide the following details about yourself

Name:

Place of employment

Email Address:

Phone Number:

4. Please state your employment position or title

5. Which of the previous WALGA Speed Enforcement Management project activities have you participated in to date?

Select all that apply, otherwise leave blank.

- Completion of the first on-line survey
- Participation in the first workshop to review an earlier version of the Models

3. Model 3: General issues

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

6. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements for Model 3.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The supply of Local Government information on vehicle speeds to WA Police will improve police's understanding of the local area roads that require speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police enforcement of vehicle speeds on problem roads identified by Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police is not a priority for funding under the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed partnership between Local Government and WA Police represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to collect and supply vehicle traffic speed data to support WA Police speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should always provide speed enforcement on local area roads identified as problem roads by Local Government	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement being implemented	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

7. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

5

6

8. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- Main Roads Western Australia
- WA Treasury via a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other (please indicate in box below)

9. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed annual vehicle traffic count program

4. Model 3: General comments

Model 3:

A partnership between Western Australian Local Government and WA Police for the supply of and use of local area vehicle traffic count data by police for strategic speed enforcement

10. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 3, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

	5
	6

5. Model 2: General issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

11. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements about Model 2

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government will help reduce local area speeding	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government is not a funding priority to support the Toward Zero strategy	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing of camera based enforcement to Local Government represents good value for money	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
It should not be mandatory for Local Government to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Local Government should be responsible for camera based enforcement of speeding only on the local area roads it is directly responsible for	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should not outsource camera based enforcement of speeding to Local Government under any circumstance	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The proposed outsourcing model generally supports the State strategy for best practice in speed enforcement	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
WA Police should retain full responsibility for the processing of digital camera images and the issue of infringement notices	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
If Local Government undertakes camera based speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police it should only be allowed to operate the LTI Trucam in 'automatic' mode and not	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

stop motorists to issue an
infringement notice

12. Please provide comments to explain why you agreed or disagreed with any of the above statements.

	5
	6

6. Model 2: General issues

Model 2

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

13. If Local Government were to undertake camera based enforcement on behalf of WA Police what would your preferred option be for the supply of a camera to Local Government for use?

For WA Police to purchase the required cameras and to loan them to Local Government at no cost

For Local Government to purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer for their exclusive use and recoup the costs as required

For regional groupings of Local Government to purchase/lease a camera from the manufacturer and share the use and recoup the costs as required

Other (please specify below)

14. Please indicate other possible means for the supply of a camera for undertaking speed enforcement on behalf of WA Police

	5
	6

7. Model 2: General issues

15. From the options listed below, please indicate who you think should fund the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the proposed vehicle traffic count program)?

Select as many as apply

- Local Government from their existing budgets
- WA Police
- WA Treasury under a cost-recovery program
- Rate payers via a Community Road Safety levy
- Other

16. Please indicate other possible sources of funding for the proposed outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement to Local Government (excluding the vehicle traffic count program component)

17. If camera based enforcement was outsourced to Local Government, please indicate your preference for the remuneration of Local Government for this service?

- That Local Government should recover all costs for the hours of camera operation and administration
- That Local Government should receive an agreed percentage of the monetary fine for each detected offence
- That Local Government receive an annual grant to finance a specified number of hours of camera operation and administration
- Other (please specify below)

18. Please indicate other possible remuneration options for Local Government

19. Table 2.5 provides a number of assumptions used to estimate the costs of outsourcing camera based speed enforcement to Local Government.

Do you have any comments to make on the accuracy or otherwise of this information or suggestions for other costs that should be considered?

8. Model 2: General comments

Model 2:

A partnership between WA Police and Local Government for the outsourcing of camera based speed enforcement

20. In the space provided, please provide any additional comments or suggestions for Model 2, including any thoughts you may have regarding potential problems for the implementation of the model

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you have any questions about the survey or your participation, please contact Peter Palamara, C-MARC, on 9266-2304 or email p.palamara@curtin.edu.au