

# TRANSCRIPT

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

### Inquiry into the Road Safety Road Rules 2009 (Overtaking Bicycles) Bill 2015

Melbourne — 3 May 2016

#### Members

Mr Joshua Morris — Chair

Ms Colleen Hartland

Mr Khalil Eideh — Deputy Chair

Mr Shaun Leane

Mr Nazih Elasmr

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Mr Bernie Finn

#### Staff

Secretary: Dr Christopher Gribbin

#### Witness

Professor Narelle Haworth, Director, Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety — Queensland.

**The CHAIR** — I declare open the Standing Committee on the Economy and Infrastructure public hearing. I will begin by explaining that the committee is today hearing evidence in relation to the Road Safety Road Rules 2009 (Overtaking Bicycles) Bill 2015, and the evidence today is being recorded. All evidence taken today is protected by parliamentary privilege, therefore you are protected for what you say here today, but if you were to go somewhere else and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by this same privilege. Professor, thank you very much for taking the time to provide us with some evidence today. Can I just begin by asking you to state your name and the capacity in which you are presenting to the committee today, and then I will ask you to move into some opening statements followed by some questions from the committee. Over to you, Professor.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — I am Professor Narelle Haworth. I am the director of the Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety — Queensland, CARRS-Q, and I am going to present some material based on the evaluation of the Queensland minimum passing distance road rule trial, which we conducted for the Department of Transport and Main Roads here in Queensland.

**The CHAIR** — Fabulous. Thank you.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — In terms of the evaluation, as you may know, Queensland introduced a trial of the minimum passing distance on 7 April 2014, so the two-year trial has just been completed. The evaluation had three objectives. The first was to look at the practical implementation of the rule — you know, how did it work out in practice? — and the second was to look at road users' attitudes and perceptions of how they may have been influenced by the rule. The third objective was to look at the road safety benefits of the rule.

In order to achieve those objectives we conducted five component studies of the evaluation. The first was actually a review of the correspondence — all of the letters and emails that had been sent to Transport and Main Roads asking about the rule — and that was a good way of actually finding out whether people were understanding or what sort of queries or reactions people had.

The second part of the evaluation was focus groups and interviews with officers of the Queensland police service. We were particularly interested in finding out what their experience was of the rule in enforcement. Thirdly, we conducted a survey of cyclists and drivers, looking at what they knew about the law, how their behaviour might have changed, what their perceptions were and so on. Then we went out and actually had cameras fitted to a whole range of different locations and collected real video data from which we were able to measure the actual passing distance, so that was, in a sense, the observational study. Finally, we looked at the crash, infringement and hospital data in regard to what the road safety benefits were.

I think one of the things that we should point out about the Queensland evaluation is that the evaluation was not commissioned until after the trial had started, and that is the major limitation of the evaluation in that we did not have that sort of time to be able to collect the data before the trial and then to be able to compare it to people's behaviour after the trial. So we tried to compare responses that were conducted from earlier research, but that was quite limited. So I think the challenge and one of the lessons that we have learnt from Queensland is that if you are going to actually have a trial, then you need to have some good information about what the situation is like beforehand.

Perhaps if I just talk a little bit about each of those three objectives; is that okay?

**The CHAIR** — Yes, that would be great.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — In terms of practicality of enforcement, we found that between the beginning of the trial in April 2014 and the end of June 2015 there were only 60 infringement notices that had been issued by police across Queensland. When we spoke with the police — we spoke to high-level officers and we also spoke to officers who were in the enforcement role every day — they said there were difficulties in collecting sufficient evidence to withstand a challenge in court. They were quite concerned about that. They said that they really needed witnesses to come forward to supplement camera evidence to be confident of their ability to get a prosecution. There is relatively limited dedicated enforcement of the rule, but nevertheless officers said that their observation was that drivers' behaviour had changed; drivers were leaving more room. The police in general were very supportive of the continuation of the rule, despite the fact that it was not easy for them to enforce.

From a driver's point of view, we set out in our survey 14 different types of situations on the road — whether there was one lane or multiple lanes, whether there was a bike lane or not, whether there were oncoming cars or cars in the other lane — and we asked drivers to then give us some idea of how easy it was to comply with the rules in all of those different situations. I thought that was a good way of getting some sort of perception of how easy it was to comply. The drivers did come up with three types of factors that were associated with difficulty in complying with the rule. One was where there were no bicycle lanes, and one was where there was high traffic volumes, so it was difficult for them to actually move past the cyclist. But interestingly they did not identify that the speed limit, as you lower it to 60, or more than 60, actually affected their ease of compliance. That was interesting. We thought they might have said it was higher when 1.5 metres was required, but they did not seem to say that. That was what we found out about the practicality of enforcement. Police found it difficult to enforce but supported it, and drivers identified particular situations where they thought it was more difficult to comply.

When we went on to look at the impact on road users' attitudes and perceptions, the police had expressed some concerns to us that motorists might have been unaware or forgot the rule. Our survey was 4332 drivers and 3013 cyclists, so we really got responses from a very large group of people. Only 0.5 per cent of the cyclists and 5 per cent of the drivers were unaware of what the requirements were of the law in terms of 1 metre and 1.5 metres. So public awareness was pretty high, but the thing that the public were perhaps less aware about were the exemptions of crossing the unbroken lines in order to overtake a cyclist. One of the conclusions we came to there was that if you are introducing such a rule, the exemptions need to be communicated well to the public so that the drivers know what they can do.

Regarding the survey results, we asked drivers and cyclists whether the distance that motorists leave had increased, and generally the cyclists and drivers said they thought it had increased. Almost all of the cyclists and about more than half of the drivers agreed that the rule was a good thing. Both drivers and riders said that the rule had actually made them more aware of cyclists on the road, which is good because that was one of the main aims of the rule.

What we then did later on was to actually observe the passing distances at a range of sites throughout Queensland. We had video of more than 18 000 bicycles and about just over 2000 natural passing events. In general the compliance with the rule varied between sites, but overall it was reasonably high. Overall in the speed zones with the speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour or less, 88 per cent of drivers were complying; they were leaving at least 1 metre. In the higher speed zones 79 per cent of drivers were leaving the 1.5 meters. So certainly the level of compliance was quite good when we actually observed it. But there were some sites where I think there was not a lot of room there and I think that contributed at some places to non-compliance. I think in general there was reasonably good community acceptance and a reasonably good level of compliance with the rule.

In regard to the road safety benefits, unfortunately here in Queensland our crash data has a couple of years lag time on it and so we were not able to get finalised crash data other than for fatalities at the time that we did the evaluation. Probably not until next year will we actually be able to have enough good final crash data to be able to look at what has changed in terms of the particular types of crashes that might be affected by the rule.

Nevertheless, though, we did compare the bicyclist fatalities for two years before the rule with the year afterwards. There had been a 35 per cent reduction in the number of cyclist fatalities per month and a 14 per cent reduction in fatalities for other road users. So while there was a larger drop in cyclist fatalities than in the road toll as a whole, that was not statistically significant because fortunately the number of bicyclist fatalities is relatively low.

Given the delays with the official crash data, the police actually gave us some preliminary crash data. This is for all crashes involving bicycles, so it is not just overtaking crashes. We looked at that for the two years before and then a year and a half afterwards and we looked particularly at the serious casualties crashes. The analysis that we did suggested that there were actually 48 fewer fatal and hospital crashes involving bicycles after the rule had been introduced than we would have predicted based on the trends before the rule. That is certainly consistent with the findings that we found from observation and also from the interviews.

We were certainly concerned to look at whether the rule might have resulted in more near misses between vehicles that were actually moving to give room to cyclists. From the crash data from the police we were not able to see any increase and certainly with the 4332 drivers, we asked them about whether they were involved in

any collisions resulting from them moving out to overtake a bicyclist and there were none reported, although some of the drivers were a bit concerned about the near misses they had been involved in.

I think this was the first study that actually evaluated one of these rules in Australia. We had good numbers of respondents to our survey and lots of observations, but of course the challenge was that we did not have information from before the trial and so that makes it a bit more difficult to come to firm conclusions. But the police's view, the survey data, the observations and the preliminary crash data seem to suggest that the rule was being accepted and having a road safety benefit. That is a very quick potted summary of the results of our research and I am certainly happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

**The CHAIR** — Excellent. Thank you very much, Professor Haworth, and I am sure committee members do have some questions. I thought I might begin with a question particularly related to the crossing over of the double white lines, which I know was part of the study as well. I have heard concerns from some that this is a hard and fast rule presently in terms of road rules, so I am just wondering if there were any concerns either amongst the community with community perception of this rule change, or if there were concerns raised by the police with this particular rule change and the possible impacts it may have.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — When we reviewed the correspondence that was sent to Transport and Main Roads, quite a few of the items of correspondence actually dealt with this issue of crossing double lines. I think that one of the challenges there was that it perhaps had not been communicated well enough. Certainly we have ingrained in us as drivers not to cross the double lines — that that is a dangerous place to cross. But what needs to be communicated is that the calculations on which the decision to put the double unbroken lines in — I am making all these things with my hands and you cannot see them — is based on the distance that a car needs to overtake another car, with the idea that the actual speed differential between the overtaking car and the other car is perhaps only maybe 10 kilometres an hour or something like that and that the car is obviously car-sized.

If the instance is actually a car overtaking a bicycle, then obviously the bicycle is smaller and also the speed differential is likely to be much greater in terms of the speed of the bicycle being quite slow compared to the car, given the car is accelerating, and so the distance taken to get around the bicycle is actually probably much less, and so the driver is spending much less time on the other side of the road than if they were overtaking a car. So in many circumstances it is still safe while there is a double yellow line — sorry, that shows where I grew up — the white line, the double unbroken line. So I think that there is a challenge in communicating that to the public and communicating it well, but also to communicate to the public that it is not a carte blanche for travelling over the double unbroken lines; it is still when the driver perceives that it is safe to do. Clearly there are instances when it will not be safe to go over the line and the driver will have to stay behind the cyclist for a bit longer until they judge that it is safe to overtake.

**The CHAIR** — Excellent. Thank you, Professor.

**Mr EIDEH** — Professor, I have a question for you. A number of transport peak bodies have made submissions objecting to a mandatory passing distance, including the RACV and the VTA. How would you suggest the government address their concern about the practicality of motorists judging the mandatory passing distance and the enforceability by police?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — I think that in terms of particularly the RACV, it would be useful to encourage them to speak to their Queensland colleagues at the RACQ. The RACQ was very concerned when they were wanting to introduce the legislation here in Queensland, but the RACQ is now quite supportive of the legislation. In fact it took part in the launch as a result a few weeks ago. So I think there has been a learning from the RACQ that the RACV could be involved in.

In terms of the VTA, I certainly recognise from the truck driver's point of view that it can be difficult. We certainly did not get a huge amount of feedback from truck drivers in terms of where it is needed, but I think that trucks and bikes sharing the road together is a very difficult issue. If we look at the fatality data from across Australia, the rate of involvement of trucks in fatal bicycle crashes is really very much higher than what we would expect. It is a real challenge and I think perhaps some of the work where bicycle organisations are working with trucking companies and trucking organisations may be the way to sort of progress this further. But certainly it is a challenging situation with trucks and bicycles. I think it just points out that the minimum passing distance is not the complete cure for any conflicts here, that there still need to be other efforts in terms of improving infrastructure as well as just changing this rule.

**Mr EIDEH** — Just another quick one, Professor. Under what conditions would you support a trial of a mandatory passing distance in Victoria? Do you support a trial?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Look, I think that one of the challenges with a trial is that the trial has to be long enough that you can actually get sensible results. If you have a trial that is only for maybe six months or one year, then it is not long enough to show whether it has worked or not worked. So if you do have a trial, I think you have to have it for at least two years. That is our experience. Even with two years, it still was not quite long enough to actually identify clearly measuring the road safety benefits. But that, I suppose, is one of the challenges. A trial has to be long. I think if you are going to have a trial, I would certainly recommend that you do not start it straight away, that you have some ability to measure what the behaviour and the attitudes and so on were like before to be able to compare with what difference the trial makes. That is the important learning.

But I think our results from here suggest that the rule does have benefits and it is certainly worthwhile trialling if you think that trialling is a useful way of getting it introduced. Some people will say to me, ‘Now it has been trialled in Queensland, anywhere else in Australia can just bring it in’. I can understand that that feeling, but of course sometimes a trial helps to build support if there is not sufficient support to actually bring something in straightaway.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Thank you. That was really interesting. I am quite interested in your evaluation process. If we had a trial in Victoria, what things should we do that you do not think happened quite right in Queensland? Obviously you are saying to us that we should have a baseline before we begin the trial. What are the things we should be evaluating during the trial?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — I think that you need to evaluate both what people think and what people do. Some people might say you only have to evaluate what people are doing, but if you only measure what people are doing you do not understand why. If there is not good compliance, then you do not understand is it because people do not know, is it because people do not understand, is it because people do not agree. I think that you need a combination of both measures of what people are doing on the road but also measures of what people understand and what the challenges are for them. Then obviously later on you need to be able to see it. Has it really made a difference to improve your safety in terms of numbers of collisions and injuries and so on? I think there are different components that you need to have a complete evaluation of how it is working. Have I answered your question?

**Ms HARTLAND** — One more thing, on the issue of using video recordings to see whether people actually were keeping distance, can you talk a little bit about how that went? If we did have a trial in Victoria, what are the kinds of things that we should do in terms of technology?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — What we did — and it is spelt out briefly in the report — we had hoped to be able to compare behaviour during the trial with some videos that had been collected by our Transport and Main Roads people for other purposes in previous years. That was the only way we thought we might be able to, after the fact, put together a comparison of what difference had happened. So we went back to the same location. We used the same company. What we found is that the road situation, particularly near the city, changes so much. Poles which were in one location and had the camera put on them had moved. A bus stop had moved. The lines had been repainted. The lanes were not the same, and also trees had grown, so you could not see with the camera in that location the cyclist or the drivers anymore. As you can see, this is a source of immense frustration for me —

**Ms HARTLAND** — Yes.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — because we had thought, ‘We can stitch this together. We can make a comparison of pre and post if we are clever’, but we were not clever enough. So if you are doing a pre and post with measuring, you have to have exactly the same location and nothing has changed. You probably need to have more pre locations than you think you will really need because things will go wrong. The council will change things or VicRoads will change things. That sounds very practical, but it really is something we learnt.

**Ms HARTLAND** — No, that is really helpful because the thing is you have got to learn from what happened with other people to make sure you do it better or you do not do the same.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — The other thing is that you have to choose locations where you expect that there will be cars passing cyclists. That sounds like a really silly, very simple thing to say, but there are lots of locations where you know there will be cyclists and you know there will be cars, but they are not always there at the same time. The cyclists are there early in the morning, and then the cars do not come until later in the day — and things like that. It really does need a lot of good knowledge about cycling and driving patterns to be able to find the locations that are actually going to have enough observations to be able to do the monitoring.

I suppose the next thing is that it would be really good to have some super-duper computerised system for actually measuring the distances automatically without people having to sit and watch the videos on slow motion and measure. But we could not get that to work, so we actually had to put a lot of resources — lots of my poor students — into watching hours and hours and hours of videos and identifying where the passing movements were and then using a computer program to measure the distance. Observation to me is the gold standard of measurement — that you are actually seeing what is happening and measuring what is happening. But it is very resource-intensive, so you certainly need to have a fairly good budget to do an evaluation. I hope that is helpful.

**Ms HARTLAND** — I have one more question, and that is on the issue of the fines that were issued during the trial. It does not appear that there were many issued. Is that because you think the education program had worked and so people knew to keep some distance? I have seen the little video that was done, which I thought was very clear and really easy to understand. Do you think that had an impact?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Look, I think that there was a real change in driver behaviour, which meant that there were not as many instances of close passing as there would have been before. But there also was a reluctance on the part of police to use this particular charge if they felt that they did not have good enough evidence to stand up in court. The police spoke at great length about this, and they said that sometimes if they felt this charge was going to be hard to prove they would use another one like ‘dangerous’ or ‘negligent’ — I cannot remember what — another charge, ‘driving with undue care and attention’ or something like that. But they said that there were other charges they could use in this sort of instance which would be easier to progress with and potentially would have a higher penalty.

I think one of the challenges of this rule was that the penalty was perhaps smaller than was initially proposed. That was I suppose a conservatism on the basis of governing — if you are bringing something in and you are not sure about it, then you probably do not bring in a huge penalty to start with. I think there are issues about enforceability. We actually would like — and this is one of our future research projects — to try to be able to work with police to develop a system whereby it would be easier for them to capture the sort of information that they need in order to proceed with the charges.

**Mr ONDARCHIE** — Professor, picking up Ms Hartland’s last point about the infringements, of the 60 MPD infringements issued to 30 June 2015, what percentage of those were issued to cyclists?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Sorry, the MPD infringement is a driver infringement, okay?

**Mr ONDARCHIE** — Thank you.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — So it is an infringement issued to the driver. I will look at the data that we have. In terms of the infringements that relate to cycling, my memory is that it is an incredibly small fraction. There were the 60 infringements there, whereas during the time after the introduction of the law for the same period there were about 2300 bicycle infringements issued to cyclists.

On top of those 2300, there were about another 6000 helmet infringements issued to cyclists. Certainly the perception of the cycling community that there was more of an increase in infringements issued to cyclists than to drivers as a result of the rule changes is true. In fact one of the things that needs to be pointed out is that the minimum passing distance rule was brought in along with other changes to rules as well which increased the penalties to cyclists if they had infringements of, you know, running red lights, failure to stop at stop signs and so on. So the net effect was not so much of an increase in fines to drivers but an increase in fines to cyclists.

**Mr ONDARCHIE** — I used that by way of example because I was in a 15-kilometre-an-hour zone yesterday and lost the side mirror because someone was passing too close to me, and it was not a motorist.

In terms of cyclist behaviour, when this rule came in, was there any evidence around cyclists' behaviour or their focus on what was going on around them because there was an expectation that everybody would be at least a metre away from them?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Certainly in our survey we did not pick up anything there in regard to what cyclists said. There were drivers who said that they did not like the rule because they felt it gave cyclists more rights on the road and things like that.

One of the things we do have in the thousands of hours of video footage that we have got is some measurements of how far the cyclists are from the kerb. If we had good pre-data we could measure to see whether that change is a function of the rule. That is probably one of the things that, if you were bringing in a trial and doing an evaluation, you would probably want to have measured — to see whether the positioning on the road of cyclists changed as a result of the rule or not. I cannot say whether it did in Queensland, but certainly that is one of the things that it would be interesting to look at.

**Mr ELASMAR** — Thank you, Professor. My understanding is that these days bicycles are increasing in number — there are more than before — and at the same time I am looking at this new rule, which is that below 60 kilometres an hour the clearance is 1 metre and above 60 kilometres it is 1.5 metres. My concern is safety not only for the cyclist but for the driver as well. If I am driving on a rural or regional country road in one lane at about 100 kilometres an hour and I need 1.5 metres to overtake the bicycle, I will probably end up on the opposite side of the road, crossing the white line; and to avoid that I need to slow down and make sure of safety first before I overtake the bike. I do not know if there is any study on whether it causes traffic delays, how wide is the road, how wide is the car, and where we end up if we want to overtake the bicycle.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — One of the things that we did was to actually ask the cyclists what sorts of roads they ride on. Certainly most cyclists most of the time are riding on roads with a speed limit of 60 kilometres or less. Of all of the kilometres done by cyclists, there are relatively few that are done on roads with limits above 60 kilometres per hour, and most cyclists do not ride on those roads. One of the reasons for that is just that it is too scary; they do not want to.

But there are certainly cyclists — and more the faster racing cyclists — who will ride on those high-speed roads. Generally the road authorities have a policy of trying to put shoulders on higher speed roads, and the reason they do that is that it allows motorists more of an opportunity to recover and, you know, prevent crashes. So shoulders are a good thing for preventing run-off road crashes by car drivers. But what will happen is that if there is a shoulder then the cyclist will want to ride on that shoulder. So if there is a shoulder then it is not so bad because you still have got the travel lane for the car and the cyclist has got the shoulder; you might need to move a little bit, but probably not go over the line.

I think the challenge is on those roads which are the lowest level classification in the road hierarchy where you do not have a marked shoulder; and then, yes, you have an issue where overtaking the cyclist might be difficult. But what I am trying to point out is that this can be an issue, but it is a small part of the overall amount of cycling and driving. Certainly our 4300 drivers did not record any problem in the time since it has been introduced in Queensland.

**Mr ELASMAR** — They probably did not, but when the rule is there, there will be a lot of complaint about it. That is what I understand, because now if you are doing a statistic of course you will not, but when the rule is there and the law is there, then that is where we hear about a lot of complaints and accidents. But thank you anyway.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — I would just like to say we did actually ask drivers about the 1 metre and the 1.5 metres, and the drivers thought the 1 metre versus the 1.5 metres was not very different, surprisingly. We asked separately because we thought they might be okay with 1 metre but not okay with 1.5 metres, but they seemed to be much the same.

**Mr ELASMAR** — Thank you.

**Mr FINN** — Professor, I was interested in those figures that you quoted for infringements, particularly I think it was 60-odd infringements for motorists and some 2000-plus for cyclists. I am just wondering if that

indicates a lack of understanding of the road rules or a disregard for the road rules on behalf of the 2000-plus cyclists who were given an infringement notice.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Okay. Sorry, I am just looking at the table in the report. I think that one of things that changing the rules did was that because the penalties were increased then the police increased their amount of enforcement and while the minimum passing distance was a hard thing to enforce, running through a stop sign or a red light is a relatively easy thing to enforce. I think that is why those numbers went up so much.

I think that there are probably some cyclists who do disregard red lights, although there is obviously research being done in Melbourne which suggests that it is more a particular type of cyclist who does that. I think in terms of the failure to stop at a stop sign some of the research that we did a couple of years ago suggests that actually motorists very often fail to stop at signs, in terms of getting that complete stop — wheels not moving at all. Cyclists do it perhaps a little bit more often. In fact our Department of Transport and Main Roads says that because there are many ‘Stop’ signs which actually should be ‘Give way’ signs according to the distances and what you can see and so on, so people are treating them as give way signs when in fact they are stop signs — but arguably should have been give way signs in the first place.

I think that there is a group of cyclists who will regularly disregard road rules, but they are potentially not the ones we are interested in from the point of view of improving people’s health and safety. We are more interested in the rest of the group who are actually more law-abiding and can perhaps benefit in terms of their health from actually being able to ride more safely.

**Mr FINN** — I am interested to hear you say that research in Melbourne is saying that a certain type of cyclist runs red lights or disregards the law in that way. Which type of cyclists might they be?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — You are going to speak to Dr Marilyn Johnson later on, I think?

**Mr FINN** — Yes, we are. She is here

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Marilyn did the research as part of a PhD at Monash. She looked at red light running on St Kilda Road. She found that, depending on what the cyclist was wearing and things like that, there were higher rates for some cyclists than others and in particular instances. Anyway, perhaps Marilyn can talk about her own research there.

**Mr LEANE** — Along with the trial rules, there would have no doubt been an education campaign to alert people about the trial and what the new rules mean. Could you expand on the campaign? How were people alerted to the rules in the trial?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Okay. Transport and Main Roads had a campaign which involved advertisements in both the major newspapers and all of the local newspapers that had a diagrammatic representation of what the distances should be and so on. There were also quite a few ads on the side and on the back of buses. There were also things done through online internet social media-type things, such as the Join the Drive campaign which was a major public interaction in Queensland. There were radio advertisements and there were also leaflets and so on which were available if you are going in to register the car and at various places. Also, the RACQ had various articles in its members’ magazines and so on. There were not a lot of the big-spending television commercials, but there was a whole range of different types of both radio and billboards — there were quite a lot of billboards too.

**Mr LEANE** — When you did your surveys did you find out in the evaluation how people became aware of this road safety initiative?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — I am struggling. I do not think we actually asked that. We did ask: were they aware of it? But I do not think we actually asked how. That certainly would have been an interesting point.

**Mr LEANE** — The answer to ‘Were they aware of it?’ — what was the percentage you got there, because that could be the overall answer to whether the education campaign worked?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Certainly only 1.5 per cent of cyclists were not aware of it and 5.2 per cent of drivers were not aware of it.



**Mr LEANE** — Thank you.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — So it was fairly well — —

**The CHAIR** — Very good. We are just looking at time.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Just a quick one following on from Mr Leane's question: how was the education done in rural and regional areas? I can understand it was the social media, but local?

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Living here in Brisbane, I am not quite sure. Certainly Transport and Main Roads could provide you with that information, but my understanding is that they probably would have done the newspaper and radio in those areas as well as here in Brisbane.

**The CHAIR** — Perhaps we could write to them and find out what their strategy was.

**Ms HARTLAND** — That would be good.

**The CHAIR** — If there are no final questions from the committee, Professor, thank you very much for your time. We appreciate your evidence today. I will just remind you that you will be provided with a copy of the transcript in coming weeks for proofreading. The transcript of your evidence today will ultimately be made public and posted on the committee's website. Once again, thank you for your contribution today. The committee will be in touch with that transcript in the future.

**Prof. HAWORTH** — Thank you very much.

**Witness withdrew.**